10/

REPORT RESUMES

ED 010 413 04
AN ANALYSIS OF STUDENT ATTITUDES TOWARD CONTEMPORARY AMERICAN MUSIC. FINAL REPORT.
BY- HORNYAK, R. ROBERT
UNIVERSITY OF CINCINNATI, OHIO
REPORT NUMBER BR-5-8288-A PUB DATE 65
REPORT NUMBER CRP-S-450-A
EDRS PRICE MF-$0.99 HC-$27.16 679P.

DESCRIPTORS- *MUSIC, *STUDENT ATTITUDES, *EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH, *QUESTIONNAIRES, *RATING SCALES, CINCINNATI, OHIO

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

ED010413

S-450
(S-8288)

UNIVERSITY OF CINCINNATI

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
Office of Education
This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the
person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions
stated do not necessarily represent official Office of Education

AN ANALYSIS OF STUDENT ATTITUDES TOWARD CONTEMPORARY AMERICAN MUSIC

Cooperative Research Project
No. S-~~390-65~~

R. Robert Hornyak

University of Cincinnati

Research Foundation
University of Cincinnati
Cincinnati, Ohio

AN ANALYSIS OF STUDENT ATTITUDES TOWARDS CONTEMPORARY AMERICAN MUSIC

Cooperative Research Project No. S-390-65

R. Robert Hornyak

University of Cincinnati
Cincinnati, Ohio

1965

The research reported herein was supported by the Cooperative Research Program of the Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

PRECEDING PAGE BLANK-NOT FILMED

Acknowledgments

The successful completion of the research project, described in this report, was possible because of the wholehearted cooperation and assistance of a number of individuals. The late Dr. John H. Mueller provided valuable guidance during the early stages of the project. Dr. Kate Hevner Mueller was most generous in devoting her time and knowledge during the development of the study, and in assisting in the evaluation of the data.

To the following I express my thanks and gratitude for their contributions to the project: To Drs. Robert L. Garretson and Elizabeth M. Taylor for their lesson plans which were vital to Part II; to Dr. Simon V. Anderson, who, in addition to preparing lesson plans for Part II, also spent many hours proofreading the final report; to Drs. Lewis E. Rowell and T. Scott Huston for their stylistic analyses of the music utilized in the research; and to Mr. Robert O. Stephenson, who served as programmer in the statistical treatment of the data.

Part II of the project was possible due to the excellent cooperation of Dr. J. William Worrel and Mr. Robert MacSpadden of the Cincinnati Board of Education, and the music teachers and principals of the schools from which the participating students came. To each I express my appreciation for their valuable contributions to the project.

The interest and cooperation of the College-Conservatory of Music Woodwind Quintet was an important factor in the conduct of Part II of the project.

Dr. George H. Lee, Administrator of University Research, and two members of his staff, MissGerri Crandall and Mrs. Virginia Atkerson, provided valuable assistance throughout the period of the research, and especially in the final compilation of the report.

To Mrs. Sylvia Mill, I am especially appreciative for her work in reproducing the multitudinous tables incorporated into the report and her dedication to the task of typing the final report.

Those who were most vital to the project were the auditors who voluntarily completed the questionnaires at each of the concerts of the Exposition of Contemporary American Music, and, in this way, provided the data for Part I.

R. Robert Hornyak

Table of Contents

Chapter I - The Problem 1

Chapter II - Objectives 3

Chapter III - Related Literature 4

Chapter IV - Procedures 7
  The Aesthetic Attitude Rating Scales 7
  Stylistic Analyses of the Music Performed 8
  Part I 8
    Attitude Survey Questionnaire 8
      Summary of Music Training Scale 9
      Auditor's Age Level Scale 11
      Auditor's Educational Attainment Scale 12
      Auditor's Occupation Scale 12
      Familiarity Scale 13
      Index of Stylistic Characteristics of the Music . 14
    Surveying the Audiences 16
  Part II 19

Chapter V - Analysis of Data and Findings 24
  Part I 24
    Stylistic Analysis 24
    Statistical Analyses 25
    Analysis of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics . 26
    The First Concert 28
      Analysis in terms of Occupation 28
      Analysis in terms of Age Level 31
      Analysis in terms of Music Training 34
      Analysis in terms of Educational Attainment . . . 36
      Analysis in terms of Familiarity 38
      Analysis in terms of Preference Responses 41
      Analysis in terms of Stylistic Characteristics . 42

    The Second Concert 81
      Analysis in terms of Occupation 83
      Analysis in terms of Age Level 92
      Analysis in terms of Music Training 100
      Analysis in terms of Educational Attainment . . . 108
      Analysis in terms of Familiarity 115
      Analysis in terms of Preference Responses 121
      Analysis in terms of Stylistic Characteristics . 125

Table of Contents (continued)

Chapter V - Analysis of Data and Findings (continued)
Part I (continued)

The Third Concert 177
Analysis in terms of Occupation 177
Analysis in terms of Age Level 181
Analysis in terms of Music Training 184
Analysis in terms of Educational Attainment . . . 187
Analysis in terms of Familiarity 189
Analysis in terms of Preference Responses 191
Analysis in terms of Stylistic Characteristics . 193

The Fourth Concert 235
Analysis in terms of Occupation 236
Analysis in terms of Age Level 247
Analysis in terms of Music Training 256
Analysis in terms of Educational Attainment . . . 267
Analysis in terms of Familiarity 275
Analysis in terms of Preference Responses 282
Analysis in terms of Stylistic Characteristics . 287

The Fifth Concert 325
Analysis in terms of Occupation 325
Analysis in terms of Age Level 328
Analysis in terms of Music Training 333
Analysis in terms of Educational Attainment . . . 336
Analysis in terms of Familiarity 340
Analysis in terms of Preference Responses 342
Analysis in terms of Stylistic Characteristics . 345

The Sixth Concert 407
Analysis in terms of Occupation 407
Analysis in terms of Age Level 413
Analysis in terms of Music Training 416
Analysis in terms of Educational Attainment . . . 420
Analysis in terms of Familiarity 424
Analysis in terms of Preference Responses 426
Analysis in terms of Stylistic Characteristics . 427

Part II 488
Music Performed in the Study 489
Statistical Analysis 490
The Elementary Category 490
The Junior High Category 499
The Senior High Category 508
Comparison of Differences in Preference Responses Between Categories 517

Table of Contents (continued)

Chapter VI - Conclusions and Implications 540
Part I 542
Part II 550
Implications for the Contemporary American Composer . . 559

Appendix A - Sample Questionnaire - Survey of Attitudes Toward Contemporary American Music, Part I 565

Appendix B - Lesson Plan Materials, Experimental Group # 1, Part II 567

Appendix C - Lesson Plan Materials, Experimental Group # 2, Part II 583

Appendix D - Sample Response Sheet, Special Concert, Part II 589

Appendix E - Stylistic Analysis of Compositions Performed at the First Concert, Part I 590

Appendix F - Stylistic Analysis of Compositions Performed at the Second Concert, Part I 595

Appendix G - Stylistic Analysis of Compositions Performed at the Third Concert, Part I 616

Appendix H - Stylistic Analysis of Compositions Performed at the Fourth Concert, Part I 622

Appendix I - Stylistic Analysis of Compositions Performed at the Fifth and Sixth Concerts, Part I . 642

Appendix J - Stylistic Analysis of Compositions used in Part II of the Study 656

Bibliography 662

List of Tables

1A Occupations of Auditors, First Concert 30
1A-1 through 1A-3 Preference Responses in terms of Occupation, First Concert 30
1B Age Levels of Auditors, First Concert 32
1B-1 through 1B-3 Preference Responses in terms of Age Level, First Concert 33
1C Music Training of Auditors, First Concert 35
1C-1 through 1C-3 Preference Responses in terms of Music Training, First Concert . . . 35
1D Educational Attainment of Auditors, First Concert 37
1D-1 through 1D-3 Preference Responses in terms of Educational Attainment, First Concert 37
1E-1 through 1E-3 Preference Responses in terms of Familiarity, First Concert 40
1F Summary of Preference Responses, First Concert 42
1G-1 through 1G-6 Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics, Composition # 1, First Concert 45
1G-7 through 1G-12 Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics, Composition # 2, First Concert 57
1G-13 through 1G-18 Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics, Composition # 3, First Concert 70

2A Occupation of Auditors, Second Concert 85
2A-1 through 2A-17 Preference Responses in terms of Occupation, Second Concert 85
2B Age Levels of Auditors, Second Concert 94
2B-1 through 2B-17 Preference Responses in terms of Age Level, Second Concert 94
2C Music Training of Auditors, Second Concert 102
2C-1 through 2C-17 Preference Responses in terms of Music Training, Second Concert . . 103

List of Tables (continued)

2D Educational Attainment of Auditors, Second Concert 109

2D-1 through 2D-17 Preference Responses in terms of Educational Attainment, Second Concert 110

2E-1 through 2E-17 Preference Responses in terms of Familiarity, Second Concert 117

2F Summary of Preference Responses, Second Concert 123

2G-1 Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics, Composition # 1, Second Concert 126

2G-2 Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics, Composition # 2, Second Concert 128

2G-3 Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics, Composition # 3, Second Concert 130

2G-4 Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics, Composition # 4, Second Concert 132

2G-5 Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics, Composition # 5, Second Concert 133

2G-6 Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics, Composition # 6, Second Concert 135

2G-7 Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics, Composition # 7, Second Concert 137

2G-8 Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics, Composition # 8, Second Concert 138

2G-9 Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics, Composition # 9, Second Concert 140

2G-10 Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics, Composition # 10, Second Concert 142

2G-11 Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics, Composition # 11, Second Concert 144

2G-12 Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics, Composition # 12, Second Concert 145

2G-13 Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics, Composition # 13, Second Concert 147

List of Tables (continued)

2G-14 Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics, Composition # 14, Second Concert 148

2G-15 through 2G-20 Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics, Composition # 15, Second Concert 151

2G-21 through 2G-26 Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics, Composition # 16, Second Concert 160

2G-27 through 2G-32 Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics, Composition # 17, Second Concert 168

3A Occupations of Auditors, Third Concert 178

3A-1 through 3A-4 Preference Responses in terms of Occupation, Third Concert 179

3B Age Levels of Auditors, Third Concert 182

3B-1 through 3B-4 Preference Responses in terms of Age Level, Third Concert 182

3C Music Training of Auditors, Third Concert 185

3C-1 through 3C-4 Preference Responses in terms of Music Training, Third Concert . . . 185

3D Educational Attainment of Auditors, Third Concert 188

3D-1 through 3D-4 Preference Responses in terms of Educational Attainment, Third Concert 188

3E-1 through 3E-4 Preference Responses in terms of Familiarity, Third Concert 190

3F Summary of Preference Responses, Third Concert 192

3G-1 through 3G-6 Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics, Composition # 1, Third Concert 194

3G-7 through 3G-12 Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics, Composition # 2, Third Concert 204

3G-13 through 3G-18 Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics, Composition # 3, Third Concert 215

3G-19 through 3G-24 Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics, Composition # 4, Third Concert 226

List of Tables (continued)

4A Occupations of Auditors, Fourth Concert 238

4A-1 through 4A-21 Preference Responses in terms of Occupation, Fourth Concert 238

4B Age Levels of Auditors, Fourth Concert 249

4B-1 through 4B-21 Preference Responses in terms of Age Level, Fourth Concert 249

4C Music Training of Auditors, Fourth Concert 259

4C-1 through 4C-21 Preference Responses in terms of Music Training, Fourth Concert . . 260

4D Educational Attainment of Auditors, Fourth Concert 268

4D-1 through 4D-21 Preference Responses in terms of Educational Attainment, Fourth Concert 268

4E-1 through 4E-21 Preference Responses in terms of Familiarity, Fourth Concert 276

4F Summary of Preference Responses, Fourth Concert 285

4F-1 Rank Order of Mean Preference Responses, Fourth Concert 286

4G-1 through 4G-5 Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics, Compositions # 1 through # 5, Fourth Concert 289

4G-6 through 4G-9 Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics, Compositions # 6 through # 9, Fourth Concert 297

4G-10 through 4G-13 Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics, Compositions # 10 through # 13, Fourth Concert . . . 304

4G-14 through 4G-17 Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics, Compositions # 14 through # 17, Fourth Concert . . . 311

4G-18 through 4G-21 Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics, Compositions # 18 through # 21, Fourth Concert . . . 318

5A Occupations of Auditors, Fifth Concert 326

5A-1 through 5A-6 Preference Responses in terms of Occupation, Fifth Concert 326

5B Age Levels of Auditors, Fifth Concert 330

5B-1 through 5B-6 Preference Responses in terms of Age Level, Fifth Concert 331

List of Tables (continued)

5C Music Training of Auditors, Fifth Concert 334
5C-1 through 5C-6 Preference Responses in terms of Music Training, Fifth Concert . . . 334
5D Educational Attainment of Auditors, Fifth Concert 338
5D-1 through 5D-6 Preference Responses in terms of Educational Attainment, Fifth Concert 338
5E-1 through 5E-6 Preference Responses in terms of Familiarity, Fifth Concert 341
5F Summary of Preference Responses, Fifth Concert 344
5G-1 through 5G-6 Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics, Composition # 1, Fifth Concert 347
5G-7 through 5G-12 Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics, Composition # 2, Fifth Concert 357
5G-13 through 5G-18 Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics, Composition # 3, Fifth Concert 367
5G-19 through 5G-24 Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics, Composition # 4, Fifth Concert 377
5G-25 through 5G-30 Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics, Composition # 5, Fifth Concert 387
5G-31 through 5G-36 Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics, Composition # 6, Fifth Concert 397

6A Occupations of Auditors, Sixth Concert 409
6A-1 through 6A-6 Preference Responses in terms of Occupation, Sixth Concert 410
6B Age Levels of Auditors, Sixth Concert 414
6B-1 through 6B-6 Preference Responses in terms of Age Level, Sixth Concert 414
6C Music Training of Auditors, Sixth Concert 418
6C-1 through 6C-6 Preference Responses in terms of Music Training, Sixth Concert . . . 418
6D Educational Attainment of Auditors, Sixth Concert 421

List of Tables (continued)

6D-1 through 6D-6 Preference Responses in terms Educational Attainment, Sixth Concert 422
6E-1 through 6E-6 Preference Responses in terms of Familiarity, Sixth Concert 424
6F Summary of Preference Responses, Sixth Concert 427
6G-1 through 6G-6 Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics, Composition # 1, Sixth Concert 429
6G-7 through 6G-12 Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics, Composition # 2, Sixth Concert 439
6G-13 through 6G-18 Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics, Composition # 3, Sixth Concert 449
6G-19 through 6G-24 Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics, Composition # 4, Sixth Concert 459
6G-25 through 6G-30 Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics, Composition # 5, Sixth Concert 469
6G-31 through 6G-36 Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics, Composition # 6, Sixth Concert 479

7A-1 Summary of Preference Responses, Composition # 1, Elementary Category 491
7A-2 Summary of Preference Responses, Composition # 2, Elementary Category 492
7A-3 Summary of Preference Responses, Composition # 3, Elementary Category 493
7A-4 Summary of Preference Responses, Composition # 4, Elementary Category 494
7A-5 Summary of Preference Responses, Composition # 5, Elementary Category 495
7A-6 Summary of Preference Responses, Composition # 6, Elementary Category 496
7A-7 Summary of Preference Responses, Composition # 7, Elementary Category 497

List of Tables (continued)

7A-8 Summary of Preference Responses, Composition # 8, Elementary Category 498
7B-1 Summary of Preference Responses, Composition # 1, Junior High Category 500
7B-2 Summary of Preference Responses, Composition # 2, Junior High Category 501
7B-3 Summary of Preference Responses, Composition # 3, Junior High Category 502
7B-4 Summary of Preference Responses, Composition # 4, Junior High Category 503
7B-5 Summary of Preference Responses, Composition # 5, Junior High Category 504
7B-6 Summary of Preference Responses, Composition # 6, Junior High Category 505
7B-7 Summary of Preference Responses, Composition # 7, Junior High Category 506
7B-8 Summary of Preference Responses, Composition # 8, Junior High Category 507
7C-1 Summary of Preference Responses, Composition # 1, Senior High Category 508
7C-2 Summary of Preference Responses, Composition # 2, Senior High Category 510
7C-3 Summary of Preference Responses, Composition # 3, Senior High Category 511
7C-4 Summary of Preference Responses, Composition # 4, Senior High Category 512
7C-5 Summary of Preference Responses, Composition # 5, Senior High Category 513
7C-6 Summary of Preference Responses, Composition # 6, Senior High Category 514
7C-7 Summary of Preference Responses, Composition # 7, Senior High Category 516

List of Tables (continued)

7C-8 Summary of Preference Responses, Composition # 8, Senior High Category 516
7D-1 through 7D-4 Summary of Preference Responses by Groups, Composition # 1 518
7D-5 through 7D-8 Summary of Preference Responses by Groups, Composition # 2 521
7D-9 through 7D-12 Summary of Preference Responses by Groups, Composition # 3 524
7D-13 through 7D-16 Summary of Preference Responses by Groups, Composition # 4 526
7D-17 through 7D-20 Summary of Preference Responses by Groups, Composition # 5 529
7D-21 through 7D-24 Summary of Preference Responses by Groups, Composition # 6 532
7D-25 through 7D-28 Summary of Preference Responses by Groups, Composition # 7 534
7D-29 through 7D-32 Summary of Preference Responses by Groups, Composition # 8 537

I

PROBLEM

In a way, a paradox exists with contemporary American music. American composers are growing in numbers and productivity, and their prestige with musicians in other parts of the world is on the upgrade. They are employing a variety of approaches and techniques, including the most advanced and exploratory; and they, together with fellow theorists, are becoming more concerned about the theoretical bases of their work and more active in explaining and defending these bases. More and more are American foundations and educational institutions coming to the support of contemporary composers and the performance of their music. And yet, never has there been a time in the recorded history of music when the gap between composer and audience has been as wide as it is today. Obviously, if contemporary American music (and other contemporary music, too, for that matter) is to become a living part of present day American musical culture, this gap between composer and audience must be closed. Strange as it may seem in the light of institutional interest in contemporary American music and its dissemination, little or no attempt to date has been made to study the nature of the gap, reasons for its existence, and ways and means of alleviating it.

This investigation, though a first and in some respects exploratory step, was a multi-dimensional approach to the problem area. Taking advantage of a Rockefeller Foundation sponsored, concentrated week's program of contemporary American music, produced jointly by the Cincinnati Symphony Orchestra and the College-Conservatory of Music of the University of Cincinnati, the first week of May, 1965, in Cincinnati, Ohio, the research surveyed the attitudes of the audiences at six concerts toward the individual compositions that were performed. A search was made for patterning of attitudes in terms of stylistic characteristics of the music, age and educational attainment of the auditors, their musical background, and their socio-economic status. The purpose was to throw some light on the nature of the gap between audience and composer, and net hypotheses as to possible reasons for the gap.

Utilizing a special concert for children, the research, with the cooperation of the Cincinnati Public Schools, in a preliminary way investigated three hypotheses concerning the responses of school children to contemporary American music:

(1) There is a positive relationship between favorable attitude and familiarity with the music.

(2) There is a positive relationship between knowledge about the composer and background facts concerning the music, and favorable response to the music.

(3) There is a positive relationship between knowledge of the structure of the music and favorable response to the music.

Obviously, these are crude hypotheses containing numerous variables, some of which may be of critical importance as differentiating factors. But they needed exploration before more rigorous research is possible.

Actually, this study was viewed as preliminary to a much more probing, definitive, and at the same time didactic study of affective responses to musical stimuli. A more probing study should provide basic knowledge which could be applied to improving the content of general music curricula and techniques of teaching music at various levels of the American educational system.

II

OBJECTIVES

The study proposed to seek answers to the following questions (those relating to each part are presented in separate groupings):

Part I

What is the relation of the stylistic features of contemporary American music to the aesthetic attitudes of auditors of the music?

Do the following independent variables affect the relationship, namely, musical training of the auditor, age level, educational attainment, socio-economic background, and familiarity with the music by the auditor?

Part II

What is the relation of familiarity with the music, as a result of previous hearings, to the aesthetic attitudes of school children?

What is the relation of knowledge of the structural and stylistic features of the music to the aesthetic attitudes of school children?

What is the relation of knowledge of the composer's background and the historical background of the music to the aesthetic attitudes of school children?

Does the age-educational level of children affect these relationships?

Is there a significant difference in the aesthetic attitudes of the children as a result of special instruction in the structural and stylistic features of the music, or special instruction relating to the composer's background and the historical background of the music?

III

RELATED LITERATURE

The most closely related research to the project is a study by Helen K. Mull.[1] Mull played two pieces of contemporary music (the first movement of Schoenberg's String Quartet III, Opus 31, and the second movement of Hindemuth's String Quartet IV, Opus 32) five times each to sixteen women who were college music students. Her purpose was to determine the effect of repetition on enjoyment of contemporary music and to see if certain passages of the music were preferred over others. She found that (1) familiarity with the two pieces of music usually increased enjoyment of it; (2) an initial unfavorable response with repeated hearing in some instances changed to a favorable response; (3) there was some general agreement concerning preferred parts of the music; (4) the generally popular sections were relatively simple and melodious in a classical sense; (5) identifiable melody and less dissonance were frequently given as reasons for preferences; (6) absence of conjunct melody and consonant harmony accounted for inconsistency of preferences; (7) neither of the compositions was very much liked, even at the end of the familiarization process.

A comment or so concerning the Mull study seems in order. For one thing, Mull investigates the hypothesis concerning the relationship between favorable attitude (enjoyment) and familiarity, but the sample is so small that it does not warrant generalization to the universe. Also, the universe of the study itself -- female collegiate music students -- is markedly different from the universe of Part II of this study. Another thing, while Mull devotes some attention to certain characteristics of the music, this is not handled systematically in the sense of stylistic analysis.

---

[1] H. K. Mull, "The Effect of Repetition Upon the Enjoyment of Modern Music," Journal of Psychology, XLIII (1957), 155-162.

A few other investigations deal with the relation between familiarity and favorable response, but not in connection with contemporary music.

A. R. Gilliland and H. T. Moore[2] studied the affects of classical and popular phonograph selections by exposing thirty-five college students to twenty-five hearings of two classical and two jazz recordings. The students' responses were measured at the first and at the twenty-fifth hearings. Comparison of the two sets of measurements indicates that the subjects tended to rank the jazz selection the same at both sessions and the classical recordings higher than the jazz recordings at both sessions -- 22% higher at the first session, and 38% higher at the twenty-fifth hearing.

June Downey and George Knapp conducted a somewhat similar study at approximately the same time.[3] This study employed the same design as the Gilliland-Moore study, but the subjects were psychology students, trained in psychological observation and of average or less than average musical ability as measured to the Seashore tests. The investigators classified recordings to which the subjects listened and responded on a four-fold basis: National feeling, poetical thought, programme music, formal construction. They found that (1) poetical thought was the category of music considered most pleasant and national thought least pleasant; (2) familiarity with a composition tended to increase favorableness of the subjects' responses; (3) order of presentation affected the attitude of the subjects. Obviously, the system of classification employed by the researchers violates basic principles of classification as well as being questionable on psycho-musical grounds.

---

[2] A. R. Gilliland & H. T. Moore, "The Immediate and Longtime Effects of Classical and Popular Phonograph Selections," The Effects of Music, (1927), 211-222.

[3] J. Downey & G. Knapp, "The Effects on a Musical Programme of Familiarity and of Sequence of Selection," The Effects of Music, (1927), 223-243.

Herbert E. Krugman[4] subjected nine psychology students to a program of listening to recorded music. Three of the students were "swing" fans; three, classical music fans; three, indifferent to all music. Krugman found that (1) five of seven students developed some degree of liking for the music to which they were experimentally exposed; (2) the students gave higher preferences to swing music than to classical music; (3) they made the greatest changes in attitude between the first and the sixth listening sessions.

All four of the studies reviewed above are limited in experimental design; consequently, their findings are of value only in the sense of hypothesis formulation and refinement.

---

[4] H. E. Krugman, "Affective Response to Music as a Function of Familiarity," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, XXXVIII, (1943), 388-392.

IV

PROCEDURES

The study was conducted in two separate parts. The first part involved the sampling of the aesthetic attitudes (in terms of preference responses) of those who attended six of the concerts of the Exposition of Contemporary American Music. The second part involved the sampling of attitudes of school children at a special concert presented by the College-Conservatory of Music Woodwind Quintet.

The Aesthetic Attitude Rating Scales

For both parts of the study an aesthetic attitude rating scale of five degrees, designed to reflect preference attitudes, was constructed to obtain aesthetic attitude ratings of music performed during the Exposition of Contemporary American Music, and at the special concert by the College-Conservatory of Music Woodwind Quintet. The scale developed by Hornyak[1] served as a guide in the preparation of the preference rating scale. It was determined, after comparing the statistical differences between the responses Hornyak obtained using his seven degree scale and the same responses equated on a five degree scale, that the five degree scale would be quite adequate for the purposes of this study. In order to minimize potential error in the use of the scale, the descriptive phrases used were reduced to very simple terms. The preference rating scale used in Part I of the study was as follows:

---

[1] R. R. Hornyak, "A Factor Analysis of the Relationships between components of Music present in Selected Music Examples and the Preference Rating Responses of College Students to the Selected Music Examples" (Mus. Ed. D. dissertation, Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana, 1964).

+2	Like very much (strong preference)
+1	Like (prefer)
0	Undecided, do not know, no opinion
-1	Dislike (lack of preference)
-2	Dislike very much (strong lack of preference)

For Part II of the study the descriptive phrases were modified because of the age levels of the school children who participated in the study. The terms "preference" and "lack of preference", were omitted and the term "a little" was inserted at the "(+1)" and "(-1)" degrees of the scale. "Undecided" was changed to "cannot decide." The preference rating scale used in Part II of the study was as follows:

+2	Like very much
+1	Like a little
0	Cannot decide, do not know
-1	Dislike a little
-2	Dislike very much

Stylistic Analyses of the Music Performed

All music performed at the six concerts of the Exposition of Contemporary American Music and at the special concert by the College-Conservatory of Music Woodwind Quintet was classified on the basis of the stylistic features of each composition by Dr. Lewis Rowell, Associate Professor of Music, and Dr. Scott Huston, Associate Professor of Composition. The actual methods of analysis employed will be discussed in connection with the analysis of the data collected.

PART I

The Attitude Survey Questionnaire.

For this part of the study it was necessary to develop a questionnaire which would provide the data reflecting preference attitudes as well as elicit information enabling the researcher to classify each person in the sample in terms of the six independent variables; music training, age, educational attainment, socioeconomic background, stylistic features of the music, and familiarity with the music by the auditor.

The Summary of Music Training Scale. To determine the music training of the auditor the "Summary of Music Training Scale" used by Hevner[2] was determined to be most appropriate for use on the questionnaire. A few minor modifications were made to the scale to bring it up to date in terms of current practices. The scale as it appeared on the questionnaire was as follows:

SUMMARY OF MUSIC TRAINING

Number of years of private lessons on piano________; voice________; other instrument (indicate instrument and number of years)____________________________

Number of years of class leasons on piano________; voice______; other instrument (indicate instrument and number of years)

____

Number of years of band, orchestra participation in high school, college, community or professional or church groups.__________

Number of years of chorus participation in high school, college, community, professional or church groups.______________________

Number of hours of college credit in music

____

Check the musical instruments in your home: Piano___; AM radio_____; FM radio____; Phonograph (hi-fi or stereo)_____; other instruments (indicate instruments and humber)_____

____

Number of persons in your family, exclusive of you, who play the piano___; other instruments (indicate instruments and number who play them)__________________________

Do you play and sing together in your home?

____

---

[2] K. Hevner, "The Theories of Aesthetic Appreciation," *Studies in Appreciation of Art* (Eugene, Ore.: University of Oregon Publications, IV, No. 6, February, 1934).

In order to assign a quantitative value to music training the following method of evaluating music training was utilized. For each year of private or class instruction and each year of participation in instrumental or choral groups, one point was given. One point was also given for each hour of college credit in music. One-half point was awarded for each musical instrument in the home, as well as for each person in the auditor's family who played an instrument. One point was given if the auditor responded affirmatively to the question, "Do you play and sing together in your home?"

When the completed questionnaires were returned each auditor's summary of music training was evaluated and a point score assigned.

The point scores of all participants were then analyzed. A careful review of the point scores indicated that they tended to fall into groupings. Those auditors who were assigned a score of 0 - 10 tended to have the following characteristics: Their formal training in music ranged from none to a maximum of one year. They indicated that they had one or more musical instruments in the home. Generally at least one member of the family played an instrument, however, they might or might not play and sing together in the home. Therefore, the auditors who had a score of 0 - 10 were determined to have had no (or very little) formal training in music, and were assigned to Music Training Category I.

Individuals receiving scores from 11 - 30 tended to fall into a second grouping. In addition to having musical instruments in the home, persons in this grouping had several years of private or class instruction and/or participation in performing groups. Generally one or more members of the family, other than the auditor, played a musical instrument. College credit in music was generally limited to six credits or less. The auditors who received a score of 11 - 30 were determined to have had a limited formal training in music and were assigned to Music Training Category II.

The third grouping of scores fell within the range of 31 - 70. Individuals within this range generally had a minimum of 25 - 30 college credits in music, in addition to several years of private or class instruction. They also indicated the presence of musical instruments in the home and generally other members of the family played at least one instrument. There were also a few individuals whose score fell into this grouping as the result of 25 - 35 years of participation in performing groups. The auditors receiving a score ranging from 31 - 70 were determined to have had a moderate amount of formal music training and formed Music Training Category III.

Individuals with fifty or more hours of college credit in music, plus several years of private and/or class instruction received scores which fell within the range of 71 - 120. Normally their formal music training corresponded with the training one would have received by at least the end of the third year in a college music program. In some instances individuals who had indicated that they had graduated from a music school with a baccalaureate degree were included in this grouping. Thus, those auditors whose score was included in the range of 71 - 120 were determined to have received extensive training in music and were grouped in Music Training Category IV.

Music Training Category V included all auditors who received a score of 121 or more. In general, they had received at least a baccalaureate degree in music, however, the majority of those in this category had a master's degree in music. They were determined to be highly trained in music.

The five categories of music training were thus determined and all auditors at each of the six concerts surveyed were classified into one of the five music training categories, commensurate with the extent of their formal music training. The five categories used in the statistical analysis were:

Music Training Category I - no formal music training
Music Training Category II - limited formal music training
Music Training Category III - moderate formal music training
Music Training Category IV - extensive formal music training
Music Training Category V - the highest degree of formal music training.

The Auditor's Age Level Scale. It was anticipated that the audiences at the Exposition concerts would vary greatly in age. Since the attitudes of college students were an important factor in the study, the age groupings were determined in such a way as to isolate individuals of college age from other age groupings. The following age groupings were used in determining the age levels of the auditors at the several concerts:

1. 21 or under
2. 22 - 25
3. 26 - 35
4. 36 - 45
5. 46 - 55
6. 56 - 65
7. 66 or older

An examination of the questionnaires returned after each concert revealed that a few high school and junior high school students had attended the concerts and participated in the survey. However, due to the fact that there were generally five or less at each concert (who responded to the survey), their completed questionnaires were not included in the study. In the statistical analysis of the data, the youngest age grouping can be considered to include those whose age ranged from 17 to 21. This was done to provide a clearer picture of the nature of the responses of those in attendance who could be considered to be of college age.

The Auditor's Educational Attainment Scale. Educational attainment was determined by having the auditor classify himself in terms of the following levels of formal educational attainment:

1. Completed the ninth grade or less
2. Attended high school but did not graduate
3. High school graduate
4. Attended College but did not graduate
5. College graduate (baccalaureate degree)
6. Received Master's degree
7. Received Doctor's degree

For the statistical treatment of the data, the seven possible categories of educational attainment were used.

The Auditor's Occupation Scale. To obtain an idea of the socio-economic background of the auditors who participated, the primary occupation of each individual was utilized. The groupings set forth on the questionnaire and utilized in the statistical treatment of the data were as follows:

1. Professional
    a. college professor
    b. elementary or high school teacher
    c. musician
    d. other
2. Proprietor, Manager
3. Dealer
4. Clerk, office worker
5. Farmer
6. Foreman, skilled labor
7. semi-skilled labor
8. unskilled labor
9. college student
10. homemaker

To provide a uniformity within the occupational categories, wives were instructed to indicate their primary occupation (normally homemaker) and also the primary occupation of their husbands. If they indicated "homemaker" as their primary occupation, they were then classified according to their husband's occupation.

The Familiarity Scale. Because many of the works which were scheduled for performance during the Exposition of Contemporary American Music had not been previously performed in Cincinnati, the researcher felt that the auditor should be given the opportunity to express his familiarity in a somewhat general sense rather than requiring those responding to the questionnaire to be specific in terms of familiarity. Therefore the statement indicating familiarity was more general, in order to permit the auditor to express a "feeling" of familiarity rather than requiring him to indicate that he had heard the work before in order to express his familiarity with the overall style of the composition. The familiarity scale developed for use in determining the auditor's familiarity with each composition was as follows:

A The composition sounds familiar, as though I have heard it before.

B I am not sure whether or not I have heard the work before.

C The composition is unfamiliar. I have never heard it before.

Letters of the alphabet were utilized as a means of distinguishing responses in preference to numerals in order to avoid attaching a positive or negative value to familiarity or unfamiliarity with a specific composition.

The Index of Stylistic Characteristics of the Music. The problem of determining an adequate means to obtain an estimate of the auditor's reactions to the stylistic features of the music performed in a way that would lend itself to statistical treatment proved to be the most difficult task in the development of the questionnaire. From a practical standpoint an individual would not have the time, during the concert, to reflect on the stylistic features of the work and provide the researcher with even a brief resumé of that which he felt significant in each work. Indeed, in anticipation of the fact that the majority of the audience at each concert would be relatively untrained, in the sense of formal music training, the researcher felt that most of those in attendance would probably not attempt to make an unstructured responses to the stylistic features of the music. In order to gain insight into the characteristics of the music which seemed most important to the auditor, the researcher deemed it necessary to set forth guidelines to be followed in indicating those stylistic features which seemed to be important. And, to assume that all persons would consider each composition in terms of its compositional techniques would be misleading. The auditor also had to have the opportunity to express an emotional or mood reaction to the music, without being required to relate such a reaction to some technical aspect of the composition.

The researcher determined that a series of statements relating to both mood and technical aspects of the music would be appropriate for use in the survey. In consideration of the listener with limited formal training, such a series of statements would need to be nontechnical in character, in order to encourage him to respond to such a listing.

Because of the wide variety of styles of contemporary music which was to be performed during the Exposition and, at the same time, the desirability of developing a uniform questionnaire that would not vary from concert to concert, it was necessary to develop a series of statements which could apply in a general sense to a number of styles rather than to each specific composition.

With these criteria in mind, the researcher compiled a listing of 85 statements relating to various technical aspects of contemporary music, and classified in terms of melody, harmony, counterpoint, texture, timbre, rhythm and structure. This listing was reduced to 29 statements, with the aid of Dr. Rowell, serving as the styles analyst.

Utilizing the adjective circle developed by Hevner[3], an additional eight statements relating to affective moods were added to the listing. A total of 37 statements thus provided the listener with the means of giving a structured response to the stylistic features of the music performed, in a way designed to reveal something of the nature of his perception of the works performed on the several concerts.

The auditor was asked to respond to the series of statements by selecting one statement which he felt reflected the most important characteristic of each composition. He was also given the opportunity to indicate additional characteristics in the order of their relative importance listing them as 2, 3, 4, etc. The series of 37 statements, reflecting general stylistic features of contemporary American music and affective mood characteristics, provided the means for the collection of data relating to the auditor's reactions to the stylistic features of each composition performed on the several concerts surveyed.

The 37 statements used were:

Affective Mood

1. Spiritual, serious, inspiring
2. Heavy, gloomy, pathetic
3. Sentimental, tender, pleading
4. Quiet, lyrical, satisfying, calm
5. Humorous, light, graceful
6. Bright, cheerful, gay
7. Dramatic, agitated, exciting, triumphant
8. Majestic, martial, vigorous

---

[3] K. Hevner, "Expression in Music: A discussion of Experimental Studies and Theories," Psychological Review, XLVII (1935), 186-204.

Melody
9. Irregular melodic contour, disjointed (angular)
10. Lyric melody
11. Could not hear a melody

Harmony (Counterpoint)
12. Block chordal structure
13. Changing tonality
14. Dissonant sounds
15. Consonant sounds
16. Masses or blocks of sounds

Texture (Style)
17. Lack of recognizable structure
18. Orderliness of structure
19. Disjointed series of sounds (pointillistic)
20. Sounds like atonal music
21. Interweaving of melodies (contrapuntal)
22. Chordal accompaniment of a single melody
23. Extreme pitch ranges (high-low) of the music
24. Ornamentation of melodies
25. Cluttered texture, busy music
26. Simple texture

Color (timbre)
27. Strange orchestral effects
28. Wind instrument color
29. String instrument color
30. Voice/choral color
31. Dynamic contrast of music
32. Percussion color

Rhythm
33. Percussive rhythms
34. Repetitive rhythms
35. Lack of strong rhythmic feeling
36. Irregular rhythms
37. Tempo or speed of the music

Surveying the Audiences.

The format of the actual questionnaire was then developed, with the ease in response to the various items being a prime consideration. The questionnaire was printed on a white cardboard stock, since the audience would not have a hard surface readily available on which to write. (A copy of the actual questionnaire used is shown in Appendix A.)

Six concerts of the Exposition of Contemporary American Music were selected for inclusion in the survey. Questionnaires were prepared for each concert. Although the same questionnaire format was used for each performance, the number of columns available for response to each composition varied because of the variation in the number of compositions being presented on each concert. As an aid in responding to the questionnaire at each concert, a slip of paper listing the compositions being performed was stapled to each questionnaire. This provided the auditor with the basic information needed in a convenient manner and did away with the need to refer from the questionnaire to the program for specific instructions.

The six concerts selected for inclusion in the survey were as follows:

1. Tuesday, May 4, 1965 - The LaSalle String Quartet.
2. Wednesday, May 5, 1965 - Members of the College-Conservatory of Music Artist Faculty.
3. Thursday, May 6, 1965 - The College-Conservatory of Music Brass Ensemble and Symphonic Wind Ensemble.
4. Friday, May 7, 1965 - The College-Conservatory of Music Chorale and Chamber Singers.
5. Saturday, May 8, 1965 - The Cincinnati Symphony Orchestra.
6. Sunday, May 9, 1965 - The Cincinnati Symphony Orchestra.

The first five concerts were held in Wilson Memorial Hall on the University of Cincinnati campus. They were evening performances. There was an admission charge for the first and fifth concerts, by the LaSalle Quartet and the Cincinnati Symphony Orchestra respectively. The second, third and fourth concerts were free public performances.

The sixth concert, a performance by the Cincinnati Symphony Orchestra, was held at the Withrow Court, on the Miami University campus, in Oxford, Ohio. It was a part of Mother's Day activities at Miami University, and was an afternoon performance, beginning at 3:00 P.M. There was an admission charge. The Music Department of Miami University was very cooperative in providing facilities and needed assistance in permitting the research staff to carry out the survey at this performance. The program was a repetition of the concert played by the Cincinnati Symphony Orchestra on the evening before.

As the audience entered the hall prior to a performance each person was given a questionnaire. Immediately prior to the beginning of the performance the project director read a prepared statement, indicating the purpose of the questionnaire and asking for the audience to participate in the survey by filling out the questionnaire. Specific instructions were given for filling out the parts of the questionnaire relating to occupation, age, formal music training and educational attainment prior to the beginning of the concert. The audience was then asked to respond to the aesthetic attitude rating scale and the familiarity rating scale at the conclusion of the performance of each composition. They were also requested to indicate which characteristic they considered to be the most significant by placing the numeral "1" in the appropriate block, and selecting other characteristics in their relative order of importance by using the numerals "2", "3", etc.

At the conclusion of each concert, ushers collected the completed questionnaires as the audience left the hall. Each questionnaire was then examined by the researcher to ascertain that it had been filled out completely. To be considered usable in the survey, the questionnaire had to have complete information relating to occupation, age, music training, educational attainment, and to show responses to each composition performed in terms of the aesthetic attitude rating scale and the familiarity scale.

After verifying the information on each questionnaire the data was transferred to punch cards. All usable data was treated statistically utilizing the 1410 IBM data processing computer at the University of Cincinnati Computing Center.

PART II

The second phase of the study was concerned with an analysis of the aesthetic attitude ratings of approximately 1300 school children from the Cincinnati Public Schools, drawn from grades four through twelve. For this phase an experimental design was set up which permitted analysis of aesthetic attitudes in terms of the training received prior to attending the special concert by the College-Conservatory of Music Woodwind Quintet.

· The participating pupils were divided into three categories according to their year in school. The first category consisted of upper elementary pupils (grades four through six). Junior high school pupils (grades seven through nine) formed the second category. The third category included senior high school students (grades ten through twelve).

Each category was divided into four groups. The first groups was the Control Group. This group received no special instruction or information prior to the concert, other than the basic information as to date and place of performance, and that they would hear a performance by the College-Conservatory of Music Woodwind Quintet.

The second group was designated as Experimental Group #1. Prior to the performance all students in Experimental Group #1 received special instruction relating to the structural and stylistic characteristics of the music. As a part of the special instruction they also heard a taped recording of each composition being performed at the concert. (The taped recording was prepared in the studios of WGUC, the University of Cincinnati FM radio station, under expert supervision, with the College-Conservatory of Music Woodwind Quintet being the performing group. Thus the same performing group was utilized in preparing the tape recording and in the live performance of the music utilized in the study.) Appropriate lesson plans relating to the structural and stylistic analysis of the music were prepared for the experimental group in each category. Dr. Elizabeth M. Taylor, Associate Professor of Theory, prepared the lesson plans for the upper elementary grades. The materials for the junior high grades were prepared by Dr. Simon V. Anderson, Assistant Professor of Music Education. Dr. Robert L. Garretson, Associate Professor of Music Education, prepared the materials for the senior high grades. (See Appendix B for lesson plans developed for Experimental

Group #1.)

The third group, designated Experimental Group #2, received special instruction which included historical backgrounds of the woodwind quintet and biographical information relating to the composers represented on the concert. Care was exercised not to discuss in any manner, the structure or style of music written by the composers represented. The basic information relating to historical and biographical backgrounds was prepared by the researcher. The individual teachers at the various grade levels adapted the material for presentation to their specific groups. Experimental Group #2 also heard the taped recording of the music in connection with the specialized instruction. (See Appendix C for a summary of the materials provided for use with Experimental Group #2).

The fourth group, Experimental Group #3, received no specialized instruction relating to the music to be performed. However, they did hear the taped recording of the music to be performed, and were given the titles and the names of the composers of the compositions heard.

The four groups of elementary pupils were equated in terms of intelligence, socio-economic background and musical background. The Cincinnati Public Schools group pupils at the elementary level in terms of achievement and intelligence test acores. The participating classes at the elementary level were selected on the basis of such groupings. Grade levels four through six were represented in each group and classes of students with high, middle, and low achievement ratings were equally included in each of the four groups.

To equate socio-economic backgrounds, classes were selected from schools in low socio-economic areas of the city, from schools considered "fringe" schools (those in neighborhoods located between low socio-economic areas and the newer suburban areas), and from schools in the suburban areas of the school district.

The classes were also selected from schools where the quality of instruction and the quantity of musical training were similar.

Therefore, it was determined, for the purposes of the experimental design, that the four groups in the elementary category were equated in terms of intelligence, age, socio-economic background and musical training.

Similar procedures were followed in selecting classes of sgudents for the junior high grades category. The classes utilized were seventh and eighth grade general music classes from junior high schools throughout the Cincinnati school district. The groups were equated in terms of intelligence by selecting classes composed of pupils in basic, general and academic programs of instruction and distributing them equally in the four groups. Classes were assigned equally to the four groups on the basis of socio-economic background by utilizing schools centered in the socio-economic areas previously described in relation to the selection of classes for the elementary level. The classes were also selected from schools where the quality of instruction and the quantity of musical training were considered to be equal.

For the purpose of the experimental design, the four groups in the junior high category were considered to be equal in terms of age, intelligence, socio-economic background and musical training.

A slightly different approach was utilized at the senior high level. The availability of students was limited at the senior high level. To achieve an equality between the four senior high groups, the senior high school choirs,from four high schools having students from similar backgrounds, were selected.

From the standpoint of the experimental design, the four groups in the senior high school category, were considered to be equal in terms of age, socio-economic background and musical training. The equating of the groups in terms of intelligence was not as clearly established, since one group was from a high school which offers only a college preparatory curriculum.

The music for the special concert was selected from the repetoire of the College-Conservatory of Music Woodwind Quintet. Because of time restrictions relating to the availability of the pupils involved in the study and the problems of maintaining interest during an extended period of time, it was decided to limit the music to be performed on the concert to a maximum of forty minutes. The works actually selected were considered from the standpoint of their structural and stylistic characteristics, and in terms of length. A variety of styles was considered important. The works selected were:

Pastoral	Vincent Persichetti
Quintet Theme and Variations	David Diamond
Quintet No. 2 Andante con moto Allegro commodo Adagio Vivace	Alvin Etler
Quintet No. 2 Allegro Allegro	William Sydeman

The stylistic differences of the music selected will be discussed in connection with the analysis of the data of the second part of the study.

All experimental groups received specialized instruction and heard the taped recordings during regularly scheduled class periods which occurred from five to ten days prior to the concert.

The participating students were then brought to Wilson Memorial Hall, at the University of Cincinnati, on Friday, November 12, 1965. The College-Conservatory of Music Woodwind Quintet presented the special concert at 1:00 P.M.

The response sheet provided all participants to permit them to record their preference responses, was printed on a white cardboard stock for ease in usage. (The actual sheet utilized is reproduced in Appendix D.)

Prior to the concert the response sheets were coded and prepared for distribution. Upon arrival at the concert each teacher was provided with response sheets for her class. They were distributed by the teacher prior to the beginning of the concert.

Immediately prior to the beginning of the concert, the project director explained the procedures to be followed in indicating preference responses to each movement heard.

After the concert was concluded, each teacher collected the response sheets for his or her class, and turned them in to assigned ushers.

The researcher then examined all response sheets to determine that they were properly completed. The data was then transferred to punch cards. All usable data was treated statistically utilizing the 1410 IBM data processing computer at the University of Cincinnati Computing Center.

V

ANALYSES OF DATA AND FINDINGS

PART I

In analyzing the data collected during the six concerts of the Exposition of Contemporary American Music, it was necessary to examine statistically the aesthetic attitudes of the auditors (as expressed in preference responses), in terms of the stylistic features of the music and the independent variables, namely, occupation, age level, formal music training, educational attainment and familiarity with the music performed.

Stylistic Analysis

To effectively study the relationship between the music performed and the attitudes of the auditors towards the music, stylistic analyses of the music needed to be presented in a manner which would be consistent with the methods utilized in collecting the data. After consultation with the styles analysts, Lewis Rowell and T. Scott Huston, the researcher determined that the best procedure to follow in the stylistic analysis would be to relate the stylistic analysis to the 37 statements of characteristics which were utilized in the questionnaire of Part I.

In addition a general statement serving to qualify or amplify the analytic profile revealed by the 37 statements could also prove useful in understanding any apparent discrepancies that arose in studying the listener responses.

With these basic considerations in mind each work, which had been performed during the six concerts of the Exposition of Contemporary American Music utilized in the study, was analyzed stylistically by Drs. Rowell and Huston. The format of the analysis for each work therefore incorporated the following:

1. A brief statement containing data about the composition, composer, medium, performance group and duration.

2. An analysis of the composition in relation to the 37 statements. Each statement was grouped to indicate the relative validity of the statement as applied to the work being analyzed. The groupings were:

a. The statement applied to the entire composition --- a characteristic that pervades the selection.

b. The statement applied to a portion of the composition --- a characteristic that is significant, but is present for only a part of the composition.

c. The statement may be technically correct, but the characteristic it described is only a peripheral element in the composition.

d. The statement did not apply to the composition; in some cases it may actually be contradictory.

3. General comments concerning the composition, qualifying or amplifying the analytic profile revealed by the 37 statements.

While completing the analyses, the styles analysts found that shorter pieces lent themselves to more definite ratings. Since the texture, tempo, mood, etc., did not change as much in the shorter works as it did in the longer compositions, categories 2a and 2d (see preceeding paragraph) were predominate. On the other hand categories 2b and 2c (see preceeding paragraph) were more prevalent in the longer works, especially in multi-movement works and those in variation form where a much greater contrast was evident, increasing the probability of many valid responses.

The complete stylistic analyses of all compositions utilized in Part I may be found in Appendices E through I.

Statistical Analyses

Two methods were utilized in the statistical treatment of the preference responses of the auditors in Part I of the study. The F test was used to examine the responses in terms of the independent variables, namely, occupation, age level, formal music training, educational attainment, and familiarity with the music. The t test was used to study the differences in preference responses between the compositions performed at each of the six concerts.

The F test essentially involved an analysis of the variance of preference responses "between" and "within" the groupings of each independent variable. If the groupings of responses, in terms of an independent variable, are random samples from the same population, the two variances, "between" and "within", are unbiased estimates of the same population variance. The F test, therefore, served as the means of determining whether or not the variance of responses within a grouping was significantly different from the variance of responses of all the groupings relating to an independent variable.

The t test essentially compared the mean preference response of the auditors to one composition with the mean preference response of the auditors to each of the other compositions to determine the significance of the differences of the preference responses between the several compositions performed at each concert.

Analysis of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics

The researcher anticipated that the responses to the Index of Stylistic Characteristics would be quite varied. Since, for each composition, there would be a number of statements which would reflect music characteristics, the auditors could be expected to be rather diverse in their responses.

In order to gain a better insight into the manner in which the auditors responded to the Index of Stylistic Characteristics, the reaearcher determined that an examination of the responses to the stylistic characteristics could best be approached by reviewing the responses in terms of one of the independent variables. A preliminary examination of the groupings of the auditors within each of the independent variables (and of the related F scores) indicated that the formal music training groupings could be best used for this purpose. The reasons for selecting this variable as a basis for analysis was twofold: (1) There was a more uniform grouping of the auditors in each of the five categories of formal music training in the data from all six concerts. (2) The pattern of responses of auditors in the five categories of formal music training was more consistent than in any of the other independent variables.

It also afforded the researcher the opportunity to see if persons with different backgrounds of formal music training would tend to react to the same characteristics of the music or if they would tend to select characteristics which would indicate that formal music training would affect the selection of stylistic characteristics present in the music.

Therefore, the responses to the Index of Stylistic Characteristics were tabulated in terms of the five categories of formal music training. An examination of this tabulation revealed that, at the concerts where the compositions performed were relatively short, the auditors tended to limit their selection of stylistic characteristics to only a first choice. However, at the concerts where the compositions performed were longer, the auditors tended to select from two to six stylistic characteristics for each composition performed. Further examination of the tabulated data revealed that, for the longer compositions, more than half of the auditors selected at least three characteristics, while less than fifty percent of the auditors selected four or more characteristics. So, for the purposes of this study, the first three characteristics, which were selected by the auditors as important stylistic attributes of each composition performed on the first, third, fifth, and sixth concerts, were more carefully examined.

In order to weigh more precisely the relative importance of the characteristics selected, the responses were assigned a value relating to their order of selection. First choices were assigned a value of three, second choices a value of two, and third choices a value of one. The weighted sum thus determined by adding the responses algebraically would be more indicative of the relative importance of a particular characteristic as far as the auditors were concerned.

Since auditors at the second and fourth concerts tended to limit their choices to one characteristic per composition, only first choice responses to compositions performed on these concerts were studied. The one exception to this plan will be discussed in connection with the analysis of data from the second concert.

The First Concert

The first concert of the Exposition of Contemporary American Music was presented by the LaSalle Quartet, the internationally reknowned string quartet-in-residence at the University of Cincinnati.

A total of 369 questionnaires were distributed to the audience as they entered the hall. 290 questionnaires were returned at the end of the concert, of which 203 were completely filled out and usable in the study. This constituted a fifty-five percent return of usable questionnaires.

Three compositions were performed by the LaSalle Quartet. They were:

1.	Quartet No. 1	Gunther Schuller
2.	Nine Variations (1959)	Ben Johnston
3.	Quartet (1949)	Leon Kirchner

Analysis of the data in terms of the independent variable, Occupation. Table 1A indicates the distribution of the auditors forming the sample for the First Concert in terms of their Occupation. As an examination of Table 1A indicates the sample was made up primarily of persons classified as college students or those whose occupation could be classified as professional. The following groupings, college professor (23), musician (22), other professionals (44), and college students (65), each contained at least ten percent of the sample and can therefore be of significance in an analysis of the data. Elementary or high school teachers (16) and proprietors, managers (17) have a limited value in the analysis. The other occupational groupings are too small to be of any value in the statistical analysis and are included only for general information.

Tables 1A-1 through 1A-3 list the preference responses in terms of occupation for each of the three compositions performed.

The F score for Composition #1 (Schuller - Quartet No. 1) is 2.041, which is significant at the .900 level. The significant difference is readily observed in the relatively low mean responses of the "other professionals", and "proprietors, managers;" when compared with the higher mean responses of the "college professors," "musicians," and "college students." (See Table 1A-1)

The F score for Composition #2 (Johnston - Nine Variations) is 2.633, which is significant at the .950 level. The pattern established by Composition #1 is more clearly evident in reactions to Composition #2 in the even lower mean responses of the "other professionals," and "proprietors, managers;" when compared to the mean responses of the "college professors," "musicians," and "college students." (See Table 1A-2)

Stylistically both the Schuller and Johnston quartets are definitely of the twentieth century. They can both be readily characterized as being dissonant, without distinguishable melodic lines in the traditional sense, disjointed, lack of recognizable structure, sounding like atonal music, employing extreme pitch ranges, and employing angular melodic lines. From the standpoint of style the Johnston quartet is more severe than the Schuller quartet.

By contrast the F score of Composition #3 (Kirchner - Quartet), 1.447, which is significant at the .750 level, does not show the variance in mean responses which were so obvious in the data from the first two compositions. The lower level of significance in the data from Composition #3 is reflected in the occupational groupings which are too small to be of any real value. Therefore the statistical significant difference indicated in the data from Composition #3 is of limited value from this standpoint. On the other hand the stylistic analysis of the Kirchner quartet stresses lyric melody, recognizable structure, interweaving of melodies --- all characteristics which imply that the work sounds more traditional. (See Table 1A-3.)

So the lack of any real significant difference in responses in the third composition, when compared to the obviously more significant differences in responses to the first two compositions strongly suggests that the less traditional works will evoke significantly different responses from certain occupational groupings, namely those in the "other professional" grouping, and, to a lesser degree, those in the "proprietor, manager" group.

TABLE 1A

Occupations of Auditors - First Concert

Occupation	Number
college professor	23
elementary or high school teacher	16
musician	22
other professionals	44
proprietor, manager	17
dealer	3
clerk, office worker	9
foreman, skilled labor	3
unskilled labor	1
college student	65
total	203

TABLE 1A-1

Preference Responses in Terms of Occupation
Composition #1 First Concert

F score - 2.041 - significant at the .900 level

OCCUPATION	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
college professor	4	11	3	5	0	0.6087
elem./h.s. teacher	1	5	7	2	1	0.1875
musician	5	11	3	2	1	0.7727
other professionals	3	21	9	6	5	0.2500
proprietor, manager	1	10	1	2	3	0.2353
dealer	0	2	1	0	0	0.6667
clerk, office worker	1	4	3	1	0	0.5556
foreman, skilled labor	0	0	0	2	1	-1.3333
unskilled labor	1	0	0	0	0	2.0000
college student	17	25	12	9	2	0.7077

TABLE 1A-2

Preference Responses in Terms of Occupation
Composition #2 First Concert

F score - 2.633 - significant at the .950 level

OCCUPATION	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
college professor	3	10	4	6	0	0.4348
elem/h.s. teacher	2	3	5	5	1	0.0000
musician	5	6	6	3	2	0.4091
other professionals	2	7	13	15	7	-0.2500
proprietor, manager	3	2	2	5	5	-0.4118
dealer	0	1	2	0	0	0.3333
clerk, office worker	2	5	1	1	0	0.8889
foreman, skilled labor	0	1	1	0	1	-0.3333
unskilled labor	0	1	0	0	0	1.0000
college student	14	20	14	13	4	0.4154

TABLE 1A-3

Preference Responses in Terms of Occupation
Composition #3 First Concert

F score - 1.447 - significant at the .750 level

OCCUPATION	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
college professor	10	8	1	3	1	1.0000
elem/h.s. teacher	7	4	5	0	0	1.1250
musician	12	3	2	3	2	0.9091
other professionals	15	21	5	2	1	1.0682
proprietor, manager	6	8	2	1	0	1.1176
dealer	1	1	0	1	0	0.6667
clerk, office worker	3	6	0	0	0	1.3333
foreman, skilled labor	0	2	0	0	1	0.0000
unskilled labor	1	0	0	0	0	2.0000
college student	29	26	3	4	2	1.1385

Analysis of the data in terms of the independent variable, Age Level. Table 1B indicates the distribution of the auditors forming the sample for the First Concert in terms of their Age Level. An examination of Table 1B shows a fairly well balanced distribution in the various age groupings with the exception of those who were 66 or older. There were only five in this group.

Therefore, the first six age groupings can be of significance in an analysis of the data.

Tables 1B-1 through 1B-3 list the preference responses in terms of age level for each of the three compositions performed.

The F score for Composition # 1 (Schuller - Quartet No. 1) is 1.640, which is significant at the .750 level. The basis for the significant difference can be seen in the lower mean responses of the "26 - 35" and "36 - 45" age groupings. (See Table 1B-1.) The difference is not particularly significant, but it does indicate a trend which is more readily observable in the responses to Composition # 2 (Johnston - Nine Variations). Here the F score is 2.063, which is significant at the .900 level. And the difference is more striking in the negative mean responses of those in the age groupings of 36 and older. (See Table 1B-2.)

On the other hand the F score for Composition # 3 (Kirchner - Quartet) is .276, which is not significant, indicating the tendency for the more traditional music to be received in a more similar manner by all age groups. (See Table 1B-3.)

The analysis of the data relating to age level indicates that the older age groupings are less likely to respond favorably to contemporary American music which does not incorporate traditional characteristics in its style.

TABLE 1B

Age Levels of Auditors - First Concert

Age Level	Number
21 or under	47
22 - 25	30
26 - 35	29
36 - 45	35
46 - 55	30
56 - 65	27
66 or over	5
total	203

TABLE 1B-1

Preference Responses in Terms of Age
Composition # 1 First Concert

F score - 1.640 - significant at the .750 level

AGE LEVEL	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
21 or under	9	23	8	6	1	0.7021
22 - 25	9	10	4	5	2	0.6333
26 - 35	4	10	8	7	0	0.3793
36 - 45	4	13	9	5	4	0.2286
46 - 55	2	17	5	3	3	0.4000
56 - 65	5	13	5	3	1	0.6667
66 or over	0	3	0	0	2	-0.2000

TABLE 1B-2

Preferences Responses in Terms of Age
Composition # 2 First Concert

F score - 2.063 - significant at the .900 level

AGE LEVEL	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
21 or under	10	14	11	8	4	0.3830
22 - 25	6	12	5	6	1	0.5333
26 - 35	7	9	7	3	3	0.4828
36 - 45	3	7	10	9	6	-0.2286
46 - 55	2	7	8	10	3	-0.1667
56 - 65	1	7	7	11	1	-0.1481
66 or over	2	0	0	1	2	-0.2000

TABLE 1B-3

Preference Responses in Terms of Age
Composition # 3 First Concert

F score - .276 - not significant

AGE LEVEL	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
21 or under	25	16	2	2	2	1.2766
22 - 25	11	12	2	3	2	0.9000
26 - 35	8	14	3	4	0	0.8966
36 - 45	16	12	3	3	1	1.1143
46 - 55	10	15	3	0	2	1.0333
56 - 65	12	9	3	2	1	1.0741
66 or over	2	1	2	0	0	1.0000

Analysis of the data in terms of the independent variable, Music Training. Table 1C indicates the distribution of the auditors forming the sample for the First Concert in terms of their formal Music Training. An examination of Table 1C shows that the majority of those forming the sample are grouped in the first three categories of formal music training. Categories IV and V (those with the highest degree of formal music training) are much smaller, hence their responses will not be as significant as the first three categories.

Tables 1C-1 through 1C-3 list the preference responses in terms of formal music training for each of the three compositions performed.

The F score for Composition # 1 (Schuller - Quartet No. 1) is 2.053, which is significant at the .900 level. Category I (no formal music training) has a significantly lower mean response in relation to the other categories. The highest mean response came from Category V (highest degree of formal music training). (See Table 1C-1).

The responses to Composition # 2 (Johnston - Nine Variations) has an even higher significant difference. The F score is 3.875, which is significant at the .995 level (the highest level of significance). (See Table 1C-2.) The negative mean response of Category I and the low positive mean responses of Categories II and III are much lower than the high mean responses of Categories IV and V. In evidence here is a pattern which will be manifest more and more in the data from the other concerts. There is a tendency for the mean responses of the five categories of music training to form a curve with the apex at Category IV (extensive formal music training). This tendency will be discussed in greater detail in connection with the analysis of data from the other concerts where the distribution of auditors among the five categories is more balanced.

The F score for Composition # 3 (Kirchner - Quartet) is .631, which is not significant. While the differences are not significant the tendency for the mean responses to form a curve with the apex at Category IV is present. (See Table 1C-3.)

The data indicates that the less traditional the music the more likely that music training will have an affect on the way in which the auditor responds to what he hears. Those with no formal music training will respond least favorably to contemporary styles while those with extensive formal music training are likely to respond most favorably, more so even than those with the highest degree of formal music training.

TABLE 1C

Music Training of Auditors - First Concert

Music Training Category	Number
I	66
II	72
III	35
IV	11
V	19
total	203

TABLE 1C-1

Preference Responses in Terms of Music Training
Composition # 1 First Concert

_F_ score - 2.053 - significant at the .900 level

MUSIC TRAINING CATEGORY	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
I	6	26	16	11	7	0.1970
II	11	35	10	13	3	0.5278
III	8	15	7	3	2	0.6571
IV	1	7	3	0	0	0.8182
V	7	6	3	2	1	0.8421

TABLE 1C-2

Preference Responses in Terms of Music Training
Composition # 2 First Concert

F score - 3.875 - significant at the .995 level

MUSIC TRAINING CATEGORY	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
I	4	16	17	22	7	-0.1818
II	13	23	13	16	7	0.2639
III	5	6	12	7	5	0.1143
IV	4	4	2	1	0	1.0000
V	5	7	4	2	1	0.6842

TABLE 1C-3

Preference Responses in Terms of Music Training
Composition # 3 First Concert

F score - .631 - not significant

MUSIC TRAINING CATEGORY	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
I	23	29	8	3	3	1.0000
II	33	28	3	6	2	1.1667
III	13	15	5	2	0	1.1143
IV	7	3	0	0	1	1.3636
V	8	4	2	3	2	0.6842

Analysis of the data in terms of the independent variable, Educational Attainment. Table 1D indicates the distribution of the auditors forming the sample for the First Concert in terms of their Educational Attainment. An examination of the distribution shows that the majority of those forming the sample are grouped in three categories, namely, "attended college, didn't graduate", " college graduate", and "received master's degree." The number of cases in the grouping "received doctor's degree," is smaller and of less significance statistically. The number of auditors forming the first three groupings is too small for those categories to be of any significance statistically.

Tables 1D-1 through 1D-3 list the preference responses in terms of Educational Attainment for each of the three compositions performed.

The F scores for all three compositions are not significant. An examination of the mean responses for those groupings which are large enough to be of significance, indicates that there was very little difference in the mean responses as a result of formal educational attainment. Hence it may be concluded that differences in the extent of formal education had no significant effect on the manner in which the auditors responded to the music presented during the First Concert.

TABLE 1D

Educational Attainment of Auditors - First Concert

Educational Attainment	Number
9th grade or less	6
att. h. s., didn't grad.	10
high school graduate	7
att. coll., didn't grad.	57
college graduate	70
received master's degree	35
received doctor's degree	18
total	203

TABLE 1D-1

Preference Responses in Terms of Educational Attainment
Composition # 1 First Concert

F score - .800 - not significant

EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
ninth grade or less	1	2	1	1	1	0.1667
att. h.s., didn't grad.	2	6	1	1	0	0.9000
high school graduate	2	3	1	0	1	0.7143
att.coll., didn't grad.	9	23	12	9	4	0.4211
college graduate	11	31	12	10	6	0.4429
received master's deg.	5	15	10	4	1	0.5429
received doctor's deg.	3	9	2	4	9	0.6111

TABLE 1D-2

Preference Responses in Terms of Educational Attainment
Composition # 2 First Concert

F score - .885 - not significant

EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Meam
ninth grade or less .	0	3	0	2	1	-0.1667
att. h.s., didn't grad.	4	2	2	2	0	0.8000
high school graduate	0	2	2	3	0	-0.1429
att.coll., didn't grad.	8	15	15	12	7	0.0877
college graduate	10	23	14	14	9	0.1571
received master's deg.	7	5	11	10	2	0.1429
received doctor's deg.	2	6	4	5	1	0.1765

TABLE 1D-3

Preference Responses in Terms of Educational Attainment
Composition # 3 First Concert

EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
ninth grade or less	3	0	0	1	2	0.1667
att.h.s., didn't grad.	5	3	1	1	0	1.2000
high school graduate	2	4	1	1	0	1.1429
att. coll., didn't grad.	20	29	5	2	1	1.1404
college graduate	29	25	8	6	2	1.0429
received master's deg.	16	12	2	3	2	1.0571
received doctor's deg.	9	6	1	1	1	1.1765

Analysis of the data in terms of the independent variable, Familiarity. Tables 1E-1 through 1E-3 indicate the preference responses to the Familiarity Scale for the three compositions of the First Concert. It should be noted that, in each case, the distribution of the responses was heavily skewed towards unfamiliarity, with over seventy percent of the auditors expressing a feeling of unfamiliarity with each composition. Thus, any conclusions drawn as a result of the statistical analysis must be viewed with caution. However, a consistency of higher mean responses in any one of the groupings can be suggestive of the reactions one might expect with regard to familiarity or lack of familiarity.

The F score for Composition # 1 (Schuller - Quartet) is 1.219, which is significant at the .500 level. The highest mean response can be observed in the "not sure" group, while the lowest mean response came from the "unfamiliar" group. The difference in the mean responses between the two groups is 0.4038, which is of a limited significance. Also the .500 level of significance of the F score indicates that the difference is just slightly above that which might occur by chance.

The F score for Composition # 2 (Johnston - Nine Variations) has a higher significance, 1.346, which is significant at the .750 level. The "familiar" grouping has the highest mean response, and the "unfamiliar" grouping the lowest mean response. In this case the 0.6251 difference in mean responses suggests a more favorable response might be expected from those who express familiarity with the work. However, the skewing of the distribution of responses towards the unfamiliar and the relatively low level of significance (.750) limits the significance of the difference.

With regard to Composition # 3 (Kirchner - Quartet) the F score is 1.363, which is significant at the .750 level. While the mean response of the "familiar" grouping is highest and that of the "unfamiliar" grouping the lowest, the basis for the significant difference is more readily discernible when comparing the ratio of "+2" and "+1" responses for each group. The "familiar" group had a much higher ratio of "+2" responses (almost three to one) than did the "unfamiliar" group (one to one). Hence the significance which can be attached to the difference in responses between "familiar" and "unfamiliar" is again limited.

In general there is an indication that familiarity does tend to elicit more favorable responses, but the evidence is by no means conclusive.

TABLE 1E-1

Preference Responses in Terms of Familiarity
Composition # 1 First Concert

F score - 1.219 - significant at the .500 level

DEGREE OF FAMILIARITY	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
familiar (30)	4	15	7	3	1	0.6000
not sure (28)	5	15	4	3	0	0.8148
unfamiliar (145)	24	59	28	23	12	0.4110

TABLE 1E-2

Preference Responses in Terms of Familiarity
Composition # 2 First Concert

F score - 1.346 - significant at the .750 level

DEGREE OF FAMILIARITY	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
familiar (25)	8	7	5	4	1	0.6800
not sure (14)	2	4	4	4	0	0.2857
unfamiliar (164)	21	45	39	40	19	0.0549

TABLE 1E-3

Preference Responses in Terms of Familiarity
Composition # 3 First Concert

F score - 1.363 - significant at the .750 level

DEGREE OF FAMILIARITY	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
familiar (24)	15	6	0	2	1	1.3333
not sure (29)	10	13	3	2	1	1.0000
unfamiliar (150)	59	60	15	10	6	1.0400

Analysis of the data in terms of preference responses. Table 1F indicates the summary of preference responses to each composition. As can be readily noted the auditors responded differently to each composition. Utilizing the t test the significance of the difference in responses becomes more apparent. When comparing the responses to the Schuller and Johnston compositions, the t score is 3.142, which is significant at the .995 level, the highest level of significance. A comparison of the responses to the Schuller and Kirchner works produces a t score of 5.384, which is also significant at the .995 level. An even higher t score of 8.024 (significant at the .995 level) is achieved when comparing the responses to the Johnston and Kirchner quartets.

The Johnston Nine Variations, the least traditional of the three compositions also received the lowest mean response. The more traditional sounding Kirchner Quartet had the highest mean response. The significance of the difference can also be readily observed when comparing the number of favorable responses (+2 and +1) with the unfavorable responses (-2 and -1) for each composition.

The inference of the data in this respect clearly indicates that the auditors responded more favorably to the work which stressed lyric melody, recognizable structure, the interweaving of the lyric melodies --- characteristics which imply a more traditional sounding composition.

One comment concerning the Schuller quartet is pertinent at this point. Of the three composers, Schuller is the best known to Cincinnati audiences. As a former member of the Cincinnati Symphony Orchestra, a recent lecturer at the University of Cincinnati's Corbett Lecture Series, and the recepient of a commission from a Cincinnatian to write a work which was premiered by the Cincinnati Symphony Orchestra, Schuller had previously created favorable impressions in the Cincinnati area. That this impression might have affected the aesthetic attitudes (preference responses) towards his quartet is suggested in the more favorable responses by the 46 - 55 and 56 - 65 age level groupings (see Table 1B-1) and by these auditors with the highest degree of music training, Category V (see Table 1C-1). It is also suggested to a lesser degree by those in Familiarity grouping "not sure" (see Table 1E-1).

Although the data collected does not clearly reveal the relationship between the composer and his audience, implications observed in summaries of the data which suggest that this relationship does affect the auditor's response are worthy of greater consideration.

Stylistically the Schuller composition is closer to the Johnston quartet than to the Kirchner work. Angular melodies not distinguishable as melodies in the traditional sense, disjointed sounds, and the feeling of atonality readily characterize the Schuller and Johnston works. Yet the groupings mentioned in the preceding paragraphs responded in a relatively more favorable manner to Schuller than they did to Johnston.

It should also be noted that the researcher did not consider the relative musical merit of the two works. Such an evaluation is beyond the scope of this study, however, it is another point which the auditor could use in determining his preference for a particular composition.

TABLE 1F

Summary of Preference Responses to each Composition
First Concert

COMPOSITION	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean	Standard Deviation
1	33	89	39	29	13	0.4926	1.1480
2	31	56	48	48	20	0.1478	1.2400
3	84	79	18	14	8	1.0690	1.1180

Analysis of the responses to the Index of Stylistic Characteristics. The responses to the Index of Stylistic characteristics were examined in relation to the stylistic analyses of the compositions performed. (The complete stylistic analyses of the works performed at the First Concert are in Appendix E.) Although the styles analysts evaluated the mood characteristics in terms of their importance stylistically, initial analyses of the responses to the characteristics indicated that the auditors quite often did not agree in their selection of mood characteristics. The researcher determined that by separating the responses to the highly subjective mood characteristics from the more objective music characteristics, the patterns of responses by the auditors could be more clearly perceived. Therefore, in the summaries of responses to the Index of Stylistic Characteristics, the responses to mood characteristics are set apart.

Tables 1G-1 through 1G-6 show the summary of responses for Composition #1 (Schuller - Quartet No. 1). The overall summary is contained in Table 1G-1. Seventy-five percent of auditors selected music characteristics as a first choice. The auditors were fairly consistent in their emphasis on music characteristics selected as the first three choices constituting seventy-seven percent of the total. The two characteristics most frequently selected were "irregular melodic contour, disjointed (#9) and "disjointed series of sounds" (#19). These two characteristics accounted for twenty-four percent of the total possible.

Next in order of frequency of selection came "dissonant sounds" (#14) and "could not hear a melody" (#11). Other characteristics which were selected by at least ten percent of the auditors as a first, second, or third choice, were "sounds like atonal music" (#20), "string instrument color" (#29), "lack of strong rhythmic feeling" (#35), "lack of recognizable structure" (#17), "orderliness of structure" (#18), and "extreme pitch ranges (high-low) of the music" (#23). All ten of the music characteristics mentioned so far were classified by the styles analysts as being Pervading Characteristics or Significant Characteristics.

It is also interesting to note that two characteristics, classified by the styles analysts as characteristics not related to the composition, were also selected as a first, second, or third choice by at least ten percent of the auditors. They were "strange orchestral effects" (#27) and "irregular rhythms" (#36).

Mood characteristics were selected by twenty-one percent of the auditors as a first choice. However, only about ten percent of the auditors selected mood characteristics as second and third choices. Thus, overall the weighted sum of selections of mood characteristics accounted for only fifteen percent of the total. Only one mood characteristic was selected by at least ten percent of the auditors, namely, "dramatic, agitated, exciting, triumphant" (#7).

Only eight auditors (of 203) failed to select at least one stylistic characteristic. 18 auditors limited their selection to one characteristic, and 29 limited their selection to only two characteristics.

Some insight is gained into the effect of formal music training on the manner in which auditors listen to music by an examination of their selection of stylistic characteristics in terms of their formal music training. Tables 1G-2 through 1G-6 contain a summary of responses for the five categories of music training.

Auditors with no formal music training (Category I - Table 1G-2) showed a greater tendency to select mood characteristics as a first choice with mood characteristics accounting for thirty-two percent of their first choices, as opposed to twenty-one percent for the entire sample. The mood characteristics Category I auditors most frequently selected were "dramatic, agitated, exciting, triumphant" (# 7) and "heavy, gloomy, pathetic" (# 2).

Auditors in the other categories, indicating formal music training, were less likely to select mood characteristics, as their percentages fell below the mean percentage for the entire sample. (The Category III percentage is approximately the same as the percentage for the entire sample.)

The music characteristics selected most frequently by the untrained auditors (Category I) were "irregular melodic contour" (#9) and "disjointed series of sounds" (#19). Third in the order of frequency was "could not hear a melody" (#11).

The one characteristic not related in the stylistic analysis of the Composition, but selected by approximately eighteen percent of the untrained auditors was "irregular rhythms" (#36).

Those auditors with limited formal music training (Category II - Table 1G-3) selected three music characteristics most frequently. They were "dissonant sounds" (#14), "disjointed series of sounds" (#19), and "irregular melodic contour, disjointed" (#9). The characteristic "sounds like atonal music" (#20) was fourth in terms of frequency.

From the characteristics not related Category II auditors selected "strange orchestral effects" (#27) and "irregular rhythms" (#36) most frequently.

The auditors with a more extensive formal music training tended to select characteristics which were emphasized by the entire sample. (See Tables 1G-4 through 1G-6.)

TABLE 1G-1

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition #1 First Concert
Overall Summary

		CHOICES			
CHATACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS					
1	6	7	1	14	33
2	10	2	4	16	38
3	4	1	4	9	18
4	6	4	2	12	29
5	4	-	3	7	15
6	2	-	1	3	7
7	10	6	5	21	53
Totals	42	20	20	82	186
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS					
Pervading Characteristics					
11	10	11	8	29	60
14	9	24	16	49	91
19	38	12	9	59	147
20	10	7	4	21	48
29	8	5	8	21	42
35	3	8	9	20	34
Totals	78	67	54	199	422

TABLE 1G-1 (continued)

Significant Characteristics					
9	31	21	10	62	145
16	1	5	3	9	16
17	5	8	13	26	44
18	10	5	5	20	45
21	2	5	-	7	11
23	6	6	9	21	39
26	3	9	4	16	31
31	3	3	2	8	17
33	-	4	10	14	18
Totals	61	66	56	183	371
Peripheral Characteristics					
10	2	-	3	5	9
15	-	-	1	1	1
25	1	3	1	5	10
34	1	1	2	4	7
Totals	4	4	7	15	27
Characteristics not related					
13	3	5	6	14	25
24	-	-	1	1	1
27	3	6	14	23	35
28	-	1	-	1	2
32	-	3	2	5	8
36	4	12	13	29	49
37	-	1	1	2	3
Totals	10	28	37	75	123

SUMMARY OF RESPONSES

Mood Characteristics	42	20	20	82	186
% of total	(20.7)	(9.9)	(9.9)	(13.5)	(15.3)
Music Character.	153	165	154	472	943
% of total	(75.3)	(81.3)	(75.8)	(77.5)	(77.4)
Number of no responses	8	18	29	55	89
% of total	(4.0)	(8.8)	(14.3)	(9.0)	(7.3)

TABLE 1G-2

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 1 First Concert
Auditors in Music Training Category I (66 in group)

	CHOICES				
CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS					
1	1	3	-	4	9
2	5	2	1	8	20
3	2	-	1	3	7
4	2	2	-	4	10
5	4	-	1	5	13
6	2	-	-	2	6
7	5	2	2	9	21
Totals	21	9	5	35	86
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS					
Pervading Characteristics					
11	7	4	2	13	31
14	-	4	2	6	10
19	10	6	3	19	45
20	1	1	-	2	5
29	1	1	4	6	9
35	2	-	2	4	8
Totals	21	16	13	50	108
Significant Characteristics					
9	12	10	5	27	61
16	-	-	1	1	1
17	1	4	5	10	16
18	2	2	3	7	13
21	-	1	-	1	2
23	2	-	3	5	9
26	-	2	2	4	6
31	-	1	-	1	2
33	-	1	6	7	8
Totals	17	21	25	63	118

TABLE 1G-2 (continued)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS(continued)					
Peripheral Characteristics					
25	-	1	1	2	3
Totals	-	1	1	2	3
Characteristics not related					
13	1	2	3	6	10
27	1	2	2	5	9
36	2	6	4	12	22
Totals	4	10	9	23	41
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES					
Mood Characteristics	21	9	5	35	86
% of total	(31.8)	(13.7)	(7.6)	(17.7)	
Music Character.	42	48	48	138	270
% of total	(63.6)	(72.7)	(72.7)	(69.7)	
Number of no responses	3	9	13	25	40
% of total	(4.6)	(13.6)	(19.7)	(12.6)	

TABLE 1G-3

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 1 First Concert
Auditors in Music Training Category II (72 in group)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	CHOICES				
	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS					
1	3	2	1	6	14
2	2	-	3	5	9
3	2	1	2	5	10
4	1	2	2	5	9
5	-	-	1	1	1
6					
7	2	2	1	5	11
Totals	10	7	10	27	54
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS					
Pervading Characteristics					
11	2	6	2	10	20
14	6	12	5	23	47
19	13	3	2	18	47
20	6	4	-	10	26
29	4	1	4	9	18
35	-	4	5	9	13
Totals	31	30	18	79	171
Significant Characteristics					
9	10	5	2	17	42
16	-	1	2	3	4
17	3	1	6	10	17
18	3	3	1	7	16
21	1	3	-	4	9
23	2	3	-	5	12
26	2	3	1	6	13
31	2	1	1	4	9
33	-	1	1	2	3
Totals	23	21	14	58	125

TABLE 1G-3 (continued)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS (continued)					
Peripheral Characteristics					
10	1	-	2	3	5
25	1	2	-	3	7
34	-	-	1	1	1
Totals	2	2	3	7	13
Characteristics not related					
13	2	1	1	4	9
24	-	-	1	1	1
27	-	2	7	9	11
32	-	1	1	2	3
36	2	3	6	11	18
37	-	-	1	1	1
Totals	4	7	17	28	43
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES					
Mood Characteristics	10	7	10	27	54
% of total	(13.9)	(9.7)	(13.9)	(12.5)	
Music Characteristics	60	60	52	172	352
% of total	(83.3)	(83.3)	(72.2)	(79.6)	
Number of no responses	2	5	10	17	26
% of total	(2.8)	(7.0)	(13.9)	(7.9)	

TABLE 1G-4

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 1 First Concert
Auditors in Music Training Category III (35 in group)

	CHOICES				
CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS					
1	1	2	-	3	7
2	3	-	-	3	9
3	-	-	1	1	1
4	3	-	-	3	9
5	-	-	1	1	1
6	-	-	1	1	1
7	1	2	2	5	9
Totals	8	4	5	17	37
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS					
Pervading Characteristics					
11	-	-	2	2	2
14	2	4	5	11	19
19	5	2	2	9	21
20	1	-	2	3	5
29	2	1	-	3	8
35	-	4	2	6	10
Totals	10	11	13	34	65
Significant Characteristics					
9	6	3	1	10	25
16	-	2	-	2	4
17	1	1	1	3	6
18	1	-	-	1	3
21	1	-	-	1	3
23	2	1	3	6	11
26	-	2	1	3	5
31	1	-	1	2	4
33	-	2	-	2	4
Totals	12	11	7	30	65

TABLE 1G-4 (continued)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS (continued)					
Peripheral Characteristics					
10	1	-	-	1	3
34	1	1	1	3	6
Totals	2	1	1	4	9
Characteristics not related					
13	-	2	2	4	6
27	1	1	4	6	9
32	-	2	-	2	4
36	-	1	-	1	2
Totals	1	6	6	13	21
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES					
Mood Characteristics	8	4	5	17	37
% of total	(22.9)	(11.4)	(14.3)	(16.2)	
Music Characteristics	25	29	27	81	160
% of total	(71.4)	(82.9)	(76.7)	(77.1)	
No. of no responses	2	2	3	7	13
	(5.7)	(5.7)	(9.9)	(6.7)	

TABLE 1G-5

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 1 First Concert
Auditors in Music Training Category IV (11 in group)

	CHOICES				
CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS					
N O N E					
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS					
Pervading Characteristics					
11	-	1	-	1	2
14	1	2	2	5	9
19	4	-	1	5	13
20	1	2	1	4	8
29	1	-	-	1	3
Totals	7	5	4	16	35
Significant Characteristics					
9	1	2	0	3	7
16	-	2	-	2	4
17	-	-	1	1	1
18	1	-	1	2	4
23	-	1	1	2	3
33	-	-	1	1	1
Totals	2	5	4	11	20
Peripheral Characteristics					
N O N E					
Characteristics not related					
27	1	-	-	1	3
36	-	-	1	1	1
Totals	1	-	1	2	4

TABLE 1G-5 (continued)

SUMMARY OF RESPONSES					
Mood characteristics	-	-	-	-	-
% of total	(00.0)	(00.0)	(00.0)	(00.0)	
Music characteristics	10	10	9	29	59
% of total	(90.9)	(90.9)	(81.8)	(87.9)	
No. of no responses	1	1	2	4	7
	(9.1)	(9.1)	(18.2)	(12.1)	

TABLE 1G-6

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 1 First Concert
Auditors in Music Training Category V (19 in group)

	CHOICES				
CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS					
1	1	-	-	1	3
7	2	-	-	2	6
Totals	3	-	-	3	9
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS					
Pervading characteristics					
11	1	-	2	3	5
14	-	2	2	4	6
19	6	1	1	8	21
20	1	-	1	2	4
29	-	2	-	2	4
35	1	-	-	1	3
Totals	9	5	6	20	43

TABLE 1G-6 (continued)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS (continued)					
Significant Characteristics					
9	2	1	2	5	10
16	1	-	-	1	3
17	-	2	-	2	4
18	3	-	-	3	9
21	-	1	-	1	2
23	-	1	2	3	4
26	1	2	-	3	7
31	-	1	-	1	2
33	-	-	2	2	2
Totals	7	8	6	21	43
Peripheral characteristics					
10	-	-	1	1	1
15	-	-	1	1	1
Totals	-	-	2	2	2
Characteristics not related					
27	-	1	1	2	3
28	-	1	-	1	2
32	-	-	1	1	1
36	-	2	2	4	6
37	-	1	-	1	2
Totals	-	5	4	9	14
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES					
Mood Characteristics	3	-	-	3	9
% of total	(15.8)	(00.0)	(00.0)	(5.3)	
Music characteristics	16	18	18	52	102
% of total	(84.2)	(94.7)	(94.7)	(91.2)	
No. of no responses	-	1	1	2	3
% of total	(00.0)	(5.3)	(5.3)	(3.5)	

Tables 1G-7 through 1G-12 contain the summary of responses for Composition # 2 (Johnston - Nine Variations). The overall summary is contained in Table 1G-7. Eighty-one percent of the auditors selected a music characteristic as a first choice. Again they were consistent, for the first two choices, in selecting music characteristics. Only sixty-seven percent selected a music characteristic as a third choice. However, the weighted sum of music characteristics selected constituted seventy-nine percent of the total. As in the first composition, the two characteristics most frequently selected were "irregular melodic contour, disjointed" (#9), and "disjointed series of sounds" (#19). These two characteristics again accounted for approximately twenty-four percent of the total possible.

Next in order of frequency came "dissonant sounds" (#14), and "lack of recognizable structure" (#17). (The reaction to the last mentioned characteristic is interesting since the title of the work clearly indicates variational form.) Other characteristics selected by at least ten percent of the auditors included "could not hear a melody" (#11), "orderliness of structure" (#18), "dynamic contrast of music" (#31), and "irregular rhythms" (#36). Six of the eight characteristics selected most frequently were classified by the styles analysts as being pervading or significant characteristics. Two, #18 and #36, were classified as peripheral characteristics.

None of the characteristics listed as "not related" were selected with any significant degree of frequency.

Mood characteristics were selected by only twelve percent of the auditors as a first choice, with no mood characteristic standing out over the others. Again, only about half as many auditors selected mood characteristics for second or third choices. Thus, the weighted sum of selections of mood characteristics accounted for only about nine percent of the total.

Only 14 auditors (of 203) failed to select at least one stylistic characteristic. 26 auditors limited their selection to one characteristic, and 54 limited their selections to two characteristics.

Tables 1G-8 through 1G-12 contain a summary of responses for the five categories of music training. The same pattern of selecting mood characteristics again occurred with the auditors in Category I selecting a higher percentage of mood characteristics, while Categories II, IV and V were below the mean for the sample. Category III again was slightly above the mean.

Auditors with no formal music training (Category I - Table 1G-8) selected two music characteristics with the greatest frequency. They were "lack of recognizable structure" (#17), and "disjointed series of sounds" (#19). Next in frequency came "irregular melodic contour, disjointed" (#9).

"Disjointed series of sounds" (#19) was selected most frequently by the auditors in Category II (limited formal music training). Next in order of frequency were "irregular melodic contour, disjointed" (#9), and "dissonant sounds" (#14).

Again the auditors with more extensive music training (Categories III, IV and V) tended to select music chatacteristics which were emphasized by the entire sample. (See Tables 1G-10 through 1G-12)

TABLE 1G-7

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 2 First Concert
Overall Summary

	CHOICES				
CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS					
1	4	-	4	8	16
2	3	2	2	7	15
3	6	3	1	10	25
4	5	3	-	8	21
5	1	1	2	4	7
6	2	-	-	2	6
7	2	3	4	9	16
8	1	-	-	1	3
Totals	24	12	13	49	109

TABLE 1G-7 (continued)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS					
Pervading Characteristics					
9	26	17	14	57	126
14	11	20	15	46	88
16	4	7	3	14	29
17	17	10	6	33	77
19	42	12	12	66	162
20	7	7	4	18	39
29	4	4	5	13	25
Totals	111	77	59	247	546
Significant Characteristics					
11	8	6	6	20	42
12	-	-	1	1	1
21	2	4	4	10	18
23	4	7	6	17	32
26	5	8	5	18	36
31	8	9	8	25	50
35	1	7	6	14	23
Totals	28	41	36	105	202
Peripheral Characteristics					
10	2	3	3	8	15
13	3	4	1	8	18
15	-	1	1	2	3
18	5	12	4	21	43
22	-	1	-	1	2
27	2	5	2	9	18
32	1	2	-	3	7
34	1	2	7	10	14
36	6	12	15	33	57
37	3	1	-	4	11
Totals	23	43	33	99	188

TABLE 1G-7 (continued)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS (continued)					
Characteristics not related					
24	-	1	2	3	4
25	-	-	2	2	2
30	1	-	1	2	4
33	2	3	3	8	15
Totals	3	4	8	15	25
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES					
Mood Characteristics	24	12	13	49	109
% of total	(11.8)	(5.9)	(6.4)	(8.0)	(8.9)
Music Characteristics	165	165	136	466	961
% of total	(81.3)	(81.3)	(67.0)	(76.5)	(78.9)
No. of no responses	14	26	54	94	148
% of total	(6.9)	(12.8)	(26.6)	(15.5)	(12.2)

TABLE 1G-8

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 2 First Concert
Auditors in Music Training Category I (66 in group)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	CHOICES First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS					
1	2	-	2	4	8
2	2	1	1	4	9
3	2	1	-	3	8
4	4	2	-	6	16
5	-	-	2	2	2
6	1	-	-	1	3
7	-	-	1	1	1
Totals	11	4	6	21	47
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS					
Pervading Characteristics					
9	5	7	7	19	36
14	-	7	5	12	19
16	3	3	-	6	15
17	10	6	-	16	42
19	11	5	4	20	47
20	1	1	2	4	7
Totals	30	29	18	77	166
Significant Characteristics					
11	1	5	4	10	17
12	-	-	1	1	1
21	-	-	1	1	1
23	2	2	-	4	10
26	4	3	1	8	19
31	-	1	1	2	3
35	1	4	1	6	12
Totals	8	15	9	32	63

TABLE 1G-8 (continued)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS (continued)					
Peripheral Characteristics					
10	1	-	1	2	4
13	1	2	-	3	7
18	-	1	2	3	4
27	2	-	1	3	7
32	1	-	-	1	3
36	5	4	2	11	25
37	1	-	-	1	3
Totals	11	7	6	24	53
Characteristics not related					
24	-	1	-	1	2
25	-	-	1	1	1
33	2	-	1	3	7
Totals	2	1	2	5	10
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES					
Mood Characteristics	11	4	6	21	47
% of total	(16.7)	(6.1)	(9.1)	(10.6)	
Music Characteristics	51	52	35	138	292
% of total	(77.3)	(78.8)	(53.0)	(69.7)	
No. of no responses	4	10	25	39	57
% of total	(6.0)	(15.1)	(37.9)	(19.7)	

TABLE 1G-9

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 2 First Concert
Auditors in Music Training Category II (72 in group)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	CHOICES				
	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS					
1	1	-	1	2	4
2	-	-	1	1	1
3	2	1	-	3	8
4	-	1	-	1	2
5	1	-	-	1	3
6	1	-	-	1	3
7	1	2	2	5	9
8	1	-	-	1	3
Totals	7	4	4	15	33
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS					
Pervading Characteristics					
9	7	6	5	18	38
14	6	7	2	15	34
16	1	2	3	6	10
17	5	1	3	9	20
19	16	5	5	26	63
20	3	4	-	7	17
29	2	2	3	7	13
Totals	40	27	21	88	195
Significant Characteristics					
11	3	-	-	3	9
21	2	3	1	6	13
23	1	2	2	5	9
26	-	2	2	4	6
31	5	4	3	12	26
35	-	1	3	4	5
Totals	11	12	11	34	68

TABLE 1G-9 (continued)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS (continued)					
Peripheral Characteristics					
10	1	2	1	4	8
13	2	1	1	4	9
15	-	1	-	1	2
18	4	6	2	12	26
27	-	2	1	3	5
32	-	2	-	2	4
34	-	1	6	7	8
36	1	5	6	12	19
37	-	1	-	1	2
Totals	8	21	17	46	83
Characteristics not related					
24	-	-	2	2	2
25	-	-	1	1	1
30	1	-	-	1	3
33	-	1	1	2	3
Totals	1	1	4	6	9
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES					
Mood Characteristics	7	4	4	15	33
% of total	(9.7)	(5.6)	(5.6)	(6.9)	
Music Characteristics	60	61	53	174	355
% of total	(83.3)	(84.7)	(73.6)	(80.6)	
No. of no responses	5	7	15	27	44
% of total	(7.0)	(9.7)	(20.8)	(12.5)	

TABLE 1G-10

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 2 First Concert
Auditors in Music Training Group III (35 in group)

		CHOICES			
CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS					
1	1	-	-	1	3
2	1	1	-	2	5
3	2	1	1	4	9
5	-	1	-	1	2
7	1	-	-	1	3
Totals	5	3	1	9	22
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS					
Pervading Characteristics					
9	6	4	1	11	27
14	2	4	5	11	19
16	-	1	-	1	2
17	1	2	2	5	9
19	9	1	1	11	30
20	1	2	-	3	7
29	1	1	-	2	5
Totals	20	15	9	44	99
Significant Characteristics					
11	3	1	2	6	13
21	-	-	1	1	1
23	1	3	3	7	12
26	-	1	1	2	3
31	1	2	1	4	8
35	-	1	2	3	4
Totals	5	8	10	23	41

TABLE 1G-10 (continued)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS (continued)					
Peripheral Characteristics					
18	-	1	-	1	2
22	-	1	-	1	2
27	-	1	-	1	2
34	1	-	1	2	4
37	1	-	-	1	3
Totals	2	4	4	10	18
Characteristics not related					
30	-	-	1	1	1
33	-	1	1	2	3
Totals	-	1	2	3	4
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES					
Mood characteristics	5	3	1	9	22
% of total	(14.3)	(9.0)	(2.9)	(8.6)	
Music Characteristics	27	28	25	80	162
% of total	(76.7)	(80.0)	(71.4)	(76.2)	
No. of no responses	3	4	9	16	26
% of total	(9.0)	(11.0)	(25.7)	(15.2)	

TABLE 1G-11

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 2 First Concert
Auditors in Music Training Category IV (11 in group)

		CHOICES			
CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS					
4	1	-	-	1	3
Totals	1	-	-	1	3

TABLE 1G-11 (continued

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS					
Pervading Characteristics					
9	2	-	-	2	6
14	1	1	3	5	8
17	1	-	-	1	3
19	1	1	-	2	5
20	2	-	2	4	8
20	1	-	-	1	3
Totals	8	2	5	15	33
Significant Characteristics					
21	-	1	1	2	3
26	-	1	-	1	2
31	1	-	-	1	3
Totals	1	2	1	4	8
Peripheral Characteristics					
10	-	1	1	2	3
13	-	1	-	1	2
15	-	-	1	1	1
18	-	2	-	2	4
36	-	1	1	2	3
Totals	-	5	3	8	13
Characteristics not related					
NONE					
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES					
Mood Characteristics	1	-	-	1	3
% of total	(9.1)	(00.0)	(00.0)	(3.0)	
Music Characteristics	9	9	9	27	54
% of total	(81.8)	(81.8)	(81.8)	(81.8)	
No. of no responses	1	2	2	5	9
% of total	(9.1)	(18.2)	(18.2)	(15.2)	

TABLE 1G-12

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 2 First Concert
Auditors in Music Training Group V (19 in group)

RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS

1	-	-	1	1	1
7	-	1	1	2	3
Totals	-	1	2	3	4

RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS

Pervading Characteristics

9	6	-	1	7	19
14	2	1	-	3	8
16	-	1	-	1	2
17	-	1	1	2	3
19	5	-	2	7	17
29	-	1	2	3	4
Totals	13	4	6	23	53

Significant Characteristics

11	1	-	-	1	3
23	-	-	1	1	1
26	1	1	1	3	6
31	1	2	3	6	10
35	-	1	-	1	2
Totals	3	4	5	12	22

Peripheral Characteristics

18	1	2	-	3	7
27	-	2	-	2	4
34	-	1	-	1	2
36	-	1	3	4	5
37	1	-	-	1	3
Totals	2	6	3	11	21

TABLE 1G-12 (continued)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS (continued)					
Characteristics not related					
33	-	1	-	1	2
Totals	-	1	-	1	2
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES					
Mood Characteristics	-	1	2	3	4
% of total	(00.0)	(5.3)	(10.5)	(5.3)	
Music Characteristics	18	15	14	47	98
% of total	(94.7)	(78.9)	(73.7)	(82.5)	
No. of no responses	1	3	3	7	12
% of total	(5.3)	(15.8)	(15.8)	(12.2)	

Tables 1G-13 through 1G-18 contain the summary of responses for Composition # 3 (Kirchner - Quartet). The overall summary is contained in Table 1G-13. One striking difference with regard to the responses to the third composition is that only fifty-six percent of the auditors selected music characteristics as a first choice. They were fairly consistent for all three choices, however, with a weighted sum of music characteristics of fifty-seven percent. The characteristic most frequently selected was "interweaving of melodies, contrapuntal" (#21). Next in the order of frequency but somewhat lower were two music characteristics- "lyric melody" (#10), and "orderliness of structure" (#18). "Cluttered texture, busy music" (#25), and "irregular melodic contour, disjointed" (#9) were selected by at least ten percent of the auditors. As an examination of the overall summary (Table 1G-13) indicates, the distribution of the auditors' selections is divided more evenly among a larger number of music characteristics. Of the five characteristics mentioned, three (#10, #18 and #21) were classified as pervading or significant characteristics, one as a peripheral characteristic (#25), and one as a characteristic not related (#9).

It is to the last characteristic mentioned that special attention should be drawn. For, while the melodic contour of the Kirchner quartet was essentially conjunct, twenty auditors indicated they heard disjunct melodic lines. This same phenomenon occurred in the selection of characteristics for certain compositions at the other concerts. What actually appears to happen is that a number of the auditors, when hearing a conjunct melody with a dissonant harmonic texture, tended to interpret this stylistic characteristic melodically as a disjunct melody, rather than as a dissonant texture. Whether this was due to a misunderstanding of the meaning of irregular melodic contour, or a tendency on the part of some auditors to incorrectly aasociate dissonant texture with melody, cannot be readily discerned. This phenomenon will be discussed at greater length in connection with other concerts.

A greater emphasis on selection of mood characteristics was evident in the fact that thirty-one percent of the auditors selected a mood characteristic as a first choice. At the same time only about half as many auditors selected a mood characteristic as a second or third choice. However, the weighted sum of selections of mood characteristics accounted for approximately twenty-three percent of the total, indicating a somewhat greater feeling of mood in the Kirchner quartet than in the other two works.

This is important because it has already been indicated that the Kirchner quartet was more traditional in style than the other two compositions. The mood characteristic selected most often was "dramatic, agitated, exciting, triumphal" (#7).

It is also interesting to note that the tendency for the untrained listener (Category I) to select a higher percentage of mood characteristics, while Categories II, IV, and V were below the mean for the sample. Again Category III mood characteristics selection falls at about the mean for the entire sample.

The responses of the auditors with no formal music training (Category I, Table 10-14) selected a mood characteristic with the greatest frequency, namely, "dramatic, agitated, exciting, triumphant" (#7). Next in frequency came "interweaving of melodies, contrapuntal" (#21). "Orderliness of structure" (#18) was also selected by approximately eighteen percent of the auditors in Category I.

The responses of the auditors in Categories II, IV and V tend to follow the overall pattern of selection, except in the case of "irregular melodic contour, disjointed" (#9), which was selected a little more frequently by those in Category II.

Those in Category III tended to follow the same pattern, with one exception. Approximately twenty-five percent of the auditors in Category III selected "dissonant sounds" (#14), a higher frequency than was found in the selections by those in the other categories.

TABLE 1G-13

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 3 First Concert
Overall Summary

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	CHOICES First	 Second	 Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS					
1	10	1	4	15	37
2	3	5	1	9	20
3	3	2	2	7	15
4	6	3	2	11	26
5	1	2	2	5	9
6	7	5	1	13	32
7	29	11	9	49	88
8	4	2	2	8	18
Totals	63	31	23	117	274
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS					
Pervading Characteristics					
10	15	12	8	35	77
29	4	6	5	15	29
Totals	19	18	13	50	86

TABLE 1G-13 (continued)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS (continued)					
Significant Characteristics					
12	-	1	-	1	2
13	1	5	2	8	15
14	5	8	2	15	33
15	1	1	4	6	9
16	3	9	4	16	31
17	1	2	1	4	8
18	8	16	11	35	67
20	3	1	2	6	13
21	21	19	13	53	114
Totals	43	63	42	152	297
Peripheral Characteristics					
11	1	1	3	5	8
22	1	3	1	5	10
23	4	1	3	8	17
25	;5	4	4	23	57
27	2	-	3	5	9
31	3	4	5	12	22
33	2	6	4	12	22
34	3	7	1	11	24
36	3	5	4	12	23
37	1	1	5	7	10
Totals	35	32	33	100	202
Characteristics not related					
9	8	6	6	20	42
19	2	1	5	8	13
24	6	1	-	7	20
28	-	2	-	2	4
30	-	1	1	2	3
32	1	1	2	4	7
Totals	17	12	14	43	89

TABLE 1G-13 (continued)

SUMMARY OF RESPONSES	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
Mood Characteristics	63	31	23	117	274
% of total	(31.0)	(15.2)	(11.3)	(19.2)	(22.5)
Music Characteristics	114	125	102	341	694
% of total	(56.2)	(61.6)	(50.2)	(56.0)	(57.0)
No. of no responses	26	47	78	151	250
% of total	(12.8)	(23.2)	(38.5)	(24.8)	(20.5)

TABLE 1G-14

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 3 First Concert
Auditors in Music Training Category I (66 in group)

	CHOICES				
CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS					
1	3	-	1	4	10
2	2	2	-	4	10
3	1	1	-	2	5
4	5	1	1	7	18
5	1	2	-	3	7
6	4	3	-	7	18
7	11	2	4	17	41
8	2	-	-	2	6
Totals	29	11	6	46	115
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS					
10	3	2	4	9	17
29	-	3	-	3	6
Totals	3	5	4	12	23

TABLE 1G-14 (continued)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS (continued)					
Significant Characteristics					
13	-	1	-	1	2
14	-	1	-	1	2
15	-	1	-	1	2
16	1	1	1	3	6
18	3	5	4	12	23
20	-	-	1	1	1
21	6	7	4	17	36
26	-	1	1	2	3
Totals	10	17	11	38	75
Peripheral Characteristics					
11	-	-	2	2	2
23	1	-	2	3	5
25	6	1	-	7	20
27	-	-	2	2	2
31	1	-	3	4	6
33	-	3	2	5	6
34	-	1	-	1	2
36	1	1	-	2	5
37	1	1	1	3	6
Totals	10	7	12	29	56
Characteristics not related					
9	1	2	2	5	9
19	-	1	-	1	2
24	2	1	-	3	8
28	-	1	-	1	2
30	-	1	-	1	2
Totals	3	6	2	11	23

TABLE 1G-14 (continued)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES					
Mood Characteristics	29	11	6	46	115
% of total	(43.9)	(16.7)	(9.1)	(23.2)	(29.0)
Music Characteristics	26	35	29	90	177
% of total	(39.4)	(53.0)	(43.9)	(45.5)	(44.7)
No. of no responses	11	20	31	62	104
% of total	(16.7)	(30.3)	(47.0)	(31.3)	(26.3)

TABLE 1G-15

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 3 First Concert
Auditors in Music Training Category II (22 in group)

	CHOICES				
CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS					
1	4	1	2	7	16
2	-	3	-	3	6
3	1	1	1	3	6
4	1	2	1	4	8
5	-	-	2	2	2
6	1	2	-	3	7
7	11	3	4	18	43
8	1	1	1	3	6
Totals	19	13	11	43	94
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS					
Pervading Characteristics					
10	6	7	2	15	34
29	2	-	3	5	9
Totals	8	7	5	20	43

TABLE 1G-15 (continued)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS (continued)					
Significant Characteristics					
13	1	3	-	4	9
14	1	1	1	3	6
15	1	-	1	2	4
16	-	3	1	4	7
17	-	1	1	2	3
18	4	5	5	14	27
20	1	1	1	3	6
21	6	6	2	14	32
26	-	-	2	2	2
Totals	14	20	14	48	96
Peripheral Characteristics					
11	-	-	1	1	1
22	-	1	-	1	2
23	2	1	1	4	9
25	4	2	1	7	17
27	1	-	-	1	3
31	2	2	-	4	10
33	-	1	1	2	3
34	1	3	-	4	9
36	1	2	2	5	9
37	-	-	2	2	2
Totals	11	12	8	31	65
Characteristics not related					
9	5	2	2	9	21
19	2	-	4	6	10
24	3	-	-	3	9
28	-	1	-	1	2
32	-	1	2	3	4
Totals	10	4	8	22	46

TABLE 1G-15 (continued)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES					
Mood Characteristics	19	13	11	43	94
% of total	(26.4)	(18.1)	(15.3)	(19.9)	(21.8)
Music Characteristics	43	43	35	121	250
% of total	(59.7)	(59.7)	(48.6)	(54.0)	(57.9)
No. of no responses	10	16	26	52	88
% of total	(13.9)	(22.2)	(36.1)	(24.1)	(20.3)

TABLE 1G-16

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 3 First Concert
Auditors in Music Training Category III (35 in group)

	CHOICES				
CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS					
1	2	-	1	3	7
2	1	-	1	2	4
3	1	-	1	2	4
7	6	2	-	8	22
8	1	1	-	2	5
Totals	11	3	3	17	42
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS					
Pervading Characteristics					
10	4	1	1	6	15
29	1	2	-	3	7
Totals	5	3	1	9	22

TABLE 1G-16 (continued)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS (continued)					
Significant Characteristics					
13	-	1	1	2	3
14	3	5	1	9	20
15	-	-	1	1	1
16	1	3	-	4	9
18	-	2	2	4	6
20	1	-	-	1	3
21	3	3	4	10	19
Totals	8	14	9	31	61
Peripheral Characteristics					
11	1	-	-	1	3
22	1	1	1	3	6
23	1	-	-	1	3
25	1	1	1	3	6
27	1	-	1	2	4
31	-	2	1	3	5
33	-	2	-	2	4
34	1	1	-	2	5
36	1	1	1	3	6
37	-	-	1	1	1
Totals	7	8	6	21	43
Characteristics not related					
9	1	1	2	4	7
24	1	-	-	1	3
Totals	2	1	2	5	10
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES					
Mood Characteristics	11	3	3	17	42
% of total	(31.4)	(8.6)	(8.6)	(16.2)	(20.0)
Music Characteristics	22	26	18	66	136
% of total	(62.9)	(74.3)	(51.4)	(62.9)	(64.8)
No. of no responses	2	6	14	22	32
% of total	(5.7)	(17.1)	(40.0)	(20.9)	(15.2)

TABLE 1G-17

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 3 First Concert
Auditors in Music Training Category IV (11 in group)

	CHOICES				
CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS					
1	1	-	-	1	3
6	-	-	1	1	1
7	-	2	1	3	5
Totals	1	2	2	5	9
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS					
Pervading Characteristics					
10	1	1	1	3	6
29	1	-	1	2	4
Totals	2	1	2	5	10
Significant Characteristics					
12	-	1	-	1	2
14	1	1	-	2	5
16	-	2	2	4	6
18	-	1	-	1	2
20	1	-	-	1	3
21	3	1	1	5	12
Totals	5	6	3	14	30
Peripheral Characteristics					
25	-	-	1	1	1
33	1	-	-	1	3
34	-	-	1	1	1
36	-	1	-	1	2
Totals	1	1	2	4	7

TABLE 1G-17 (continued)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS (continued)					
Characteristics not related					
9	1	-	-	1	3
Totals	1	-	-	1	3
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES					
Mood Characteristics	1	2	2	5	9
% of total	(9.1)	(18.2)	(18.2)	(15.2)	(13.6)
Music Characteristics	9	8	7	24	50
% of total	(81.8)	(72.7)	(63.6)	(72.7)	(75.8)
No. of no responses	1	1	2	4	7
% of total	(9.1)	(9.1)	(18.2)	(12.1)	(10.6)

TABLE 1G-18

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 3 First Concert
Auditors in Music Training Category V (19 in group)

		CHOICES			
CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS					
6	2	-	-	2	6
7	1	2	-	3	7
8	-	-	1	1	1
Totals	3	2	1	6	14

TABLE 1G-18 (continued)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS					
Pervading Characteristics					
10	1	1	-	2	5
29	-	1	1	2	3
Totals	1	2	1	4	8
Significant Characteristics					
13	-	-	1	1	1
15	-	-	2	2	2
16	1	-	-	1	3
17	1	1	-	2	5
18	1	3	-	4	9
21	3	2	2	7	15
Totals	6	6	5	17	35
Peripheral Characteristics					
11	-	1	-	1	2
22	-	1	-	1	2
25	4	-	1	5	13
31	-	-	1	1	1
33	1	-	1	2	4
34	1	2	-	3	7
36	-	-	1	1	1
37	-	-	1	1	1
Totals	6	4	5	15	31
Characteristics not related					
9	-	1	-	1	2
19	-	-	1	1	1
30	-	-	1	1	1
32	1	-	-	1	3
Totals	1	1	2	4	7

TABLE 1G-18 (continued)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES					
Mood Characteristics	3	2	1	6	14
% of total	(15.6)	(10.5)	(5.3)	(10.5)	(12.3)
Music Characteristics	14	13	13	40	81
% of total	(73.7)	(68.4)	(68.4)	(70.2)	(71.1)
No. of no responses	2	4	5	11	19
% of total	(10.5)	(21.1)	(26.3)	(19.3)	(16.6)

At this point certain generalizations can be made with respect to the manner in which auditors reacted to characteristics present in the compositions heard. The untrained listener appeared to place a greater emphasis on mood characteristics than did the trained listener. However, all auditors tended to select characteristics which had been classified as pervading or significant. A confusion in the minds of some of the auditors existed as to the difference between disjunct melodic lines and conjunct melodic lines with a dissonant harmonic texture.

Second Concert

The second concert of the Exposition of Contemporary American Music was presented by members of the artist faculty of the College-Conservatory of Music of the University of Cincinnati.

A total of 317 questionnaires were distributed to the audience as they entered the hall. 296 questionnaires were returned at the end of the concert, of which 87 were completely filled out and usable in the study. This constituted a twenty-eight percent return of usable questionnaires.

Seventeen compositions were performed by the artist faculty. They were:

Five Songs — Charles E. Ives
1. Feldeinsamkeit (1898)
2. Watchman! (1913)
3. The Cage (1906)
4. Thoreau (1915)
5. General William Booth enters into Heaven (1914)
Lewis E. Whikehart, baritone
Robert K. Evans, piano

Four Epitaphs, Op. 79 (1964) — Jeno Takacs
6. Praeludium (for Paul Hindemuth)
7. Elegie (for Claude Debussy)
8. A Fragment (for Alban Berg)
9. Dialogue-Nocturne (for Bela Bartok)
Jeno Takacs, piano

Five Poems (Goethe) — Robert K. Evans
10. Blick um Blick
11. Dem aufgehenden Vollmonde
12. Finnisches Lied
13. Im Vorubergehen
14. Gleich und Gleich
Lucile Villeneuve Evans, Mezzo-contralto
Robert K. Evans, piano

15. Sonata Concertante — Peter Mennin
Sigmund Effron, violin
Babette Effron, piano

16. Quintet for Winds — Daniel Kingman
17. Woodwind Quintet No. 2 — William Sydeman
The College-Conservatory of Music Woodwind Quintet

In contrast to the somewhat longer compositions presented at the first concert, the first 14 compositions performed at the second concert were individually quite short. They were divided into three basic groupings. The first five works were a set of unrelated songs by Ives. The next four compositions were a set of short piano pieces, unified by the epitaph theme, yet individualistic from the standpoint of style. These were followed by a set of five Goethe poems, related primarily in the sense that the songs were musical settings of the poems of Goethe.

The fifteenth composition was an instrumental sonata for violin and piano. It was a three movement work, requiring approximately 20 minutes to perform.

The last two works were woodwind quintet pieces. The Kingman quintet (#16) was a three movement work, lasting approximately 11 minutes. The Sydeman quintet (#17) was a four movement work, requiring approximately 14 minutes to perform.

Therefore, in analyzing the data from the second concert, care was exercised in placing too great an emphasis on relationships between the first 14 pieces and the last three more extended works. Rather, it was deemed more advisable to place the emphasis upon comparisons between the pieces in each of the first three sets of works, and then examine the final three compositions more or less individually. Thus, in the second concert, the researcher had the opportunity to study the manner in which the same group of auditors reacted to short works with a minimum of change of style within the work, as well as the way in which they reacted to more extended works with greater variety from a stylistic standpoint.

Analysis of the data in terms of the independent variable, Occupation. Table 2A indicates the distribution of the auditors forming the sample for the second concert in terms of their Occupation. An examination of Table 2A points out that there are only three groups which are large enough to be of significance in the analysis of the data, namely, "musician," "other professionals," and "college students." The other groupings were too small to be of any real significance and are included for general information concerning the make-up of the sample.

Tables 2A-1 through 2A-17 list the preference responses in terms of occupation for each of the 17 compositions performed.

Of the first group of songs by Ives, only one elicited responses which were significantly different to any degree, Composition # 5 (Ives -General Booth etc.). The F score for this work was 1.321, which is significant at the .750 level. The negative mean response of those in the "other professionals" group was in sharp contrast to the relatively high positive mean responses of the "musicians" and the "college students." (See Table 2A-5.) This song, quoting fragments of a gospel song as a principle thematic idea throughout and utilizing special rhythmic effects, was probably the most striking song from the standpoint of style, in the Ives set of songs. The rather striking use of special effects, especially a usage of the gospel song melody in a way which could be viewed as satirical, quite possibly could account for this difference. It should be further stated that the difference in responses indicated was of a limited significance.

A further examination of the data relating to responses to the Ives' songs in terms of occupation, indicated that in only one other song, Composition # 4 (Ives - Thoreau), was there any sizable difference in mean responses between the three primary groupings. The relatively low mean response of the "college student" group was due to some degree to the fairly large number of auditors who indicated that they were "undecided" ("0")as to preference or lack of preference for the work. (See Table 2A-4.)

There were no significant differences in the responses (in terms of occupation) observed in the set of piano pieces by Takacs (Four Epitaphs).

However, in the settings of the five Goethe poems by Evans, a significant difference in the responses was noted in three of the five songs. For Composition # 10 (Blick um Blick) the F score was 1.057, significant at the .500 level (limited significance). The difference is readily noted in comparing the mean responses of the "musician" and "other professionals" groups. The mean response of the "musician" group is over one-half a degree lower than the mean response of the "other professionals." The same phenomena can also be observed in the responses to Composition # 13 (Im Vorubergehen), with an F score of 1.468, significant at the .750 level. Similar differences in responses can also be observed in the data for Composition # 11 (Dem aufgehenden Vollmonde) and Composition # 12 (Finnisches Lied), although these differences are not significant. The mean responses of the "college student" group in each of the five compositions tend to be at about the same level as those of the "musicians." (See Tables 2A-10 through 2A-14.)

Thus, the analysis suggests that the auditors forming the "other professionals" group tended to react more favorably to the settings of the Goethe poems than did those in the "musician" and "college student" groups.

There were no significant differences in the responses (in terms of occupation) observed in the final three instrumental compositions. (See Tables 2A-15 through 2A-17.)

From the standpoint of responses in terms of occupation, where significant differences do occur, those auditors classified as "other professionals" tend to differ significantly in their responses from those who are classed as "musicians" and "college student."

TABLE 2A

Occupations of Auditors - Second Concert

Occupation	Number
college professor	3
elementary of high school teacher	3
musician	11
other professionals	18
proprietor, manager	6
clerk, office worker	5
farmer	1
college student	40
Total	87

TABLE 2A-1

Preference Responses in Terms of Occupation
Composition # 1 Second Concert

F score - .452 - not significant

OCCUPATION	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
college professor	1	2	0	0	0	1.3333
elem./h.s. teacher	0	2	0	0	1	0.0000
musician	2	8	0	1	0	1.0000
other professionals	7	9	1	1	0	1.2222
proprietor, manager	2	3	1	0	0	1.1667
farmer	0	1	0	0	0	1.0000
clerk, office worker	2	0	2	1	0	0.6000
college student	11	21	5	3	0	1.0000

TABLE 2A-2

Preference Responses in Terms of Occupation
Composition # 2 Second Concert

F score - .604 - not significant

OCCUPATION	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
college professor	0	3	0	0	0	1.0000
elem./h.s. teacher	0	1	0	2	0	-0.3333
musician	2	5	3	1	0	0.7273
other professionals	4	10	2	2	0	0.8889
proprietor, manager	0	2	3	1	0	0.1667
clerk, office worker	0	2	2	1	0	0.2000
farmer	0	1	0	0	0	1.0000
college student	3	18	12	6	1	0.4000

TABLE 2A-3

Preference Responses in Terms of Occupation
Composition # 3 Second Concert

F score - .594 - not significant

OCCUPATION	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
college professor	1	2	0	0	0	1.3333
elem.h.s. teacher	1	2	0	0	0	1.3333
musician	2	5	2	2	0	0.6364
other professionals	2	7	6	3	0	0.4444
proprietor, manager	0	2	1	3	0	-0.1667
clerk, office worker	0	1	2	2	0	-0.2000
farmer	0	1	0	0	0	1.0000
college student	9	13	11	6	2	0.4750

TABLE 2A-4

Preference Responses in Terms of Occupation
Composition # 4 Second Concert

F score - .601 - not significant

OCCUPATION	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
college professor	0	3	0	0	0	1.0000
elem./h.s. teacher	0	3	0	0	0	1.0000
musician	2	5	4	0	0	0.8182

TABLE 2A-4 (continued)

OCCUPATION	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
other professionals	2	12	3	1	0	0.8333
proprietor, manager	1	1	2	2	0	0.1667
clerk, office worker	0	2	3	0	0	0.4000
farmer	0	1	0	0	0	1.0000
college student	2	18	14	4	2	0.3500

TABLE 2A-5

Preference Responses in Terms of Occupation
Composition # 5 Second Concert

OCCUPATION	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
F score - 1.321 - significant at the .750 level						
college professor	1	1	0	0	1	0.3333
elem./h.s. teacher	2	1	0	0	0	1.6667
musician	6	4	0	1	0	1.3636
other professionals	2	3	6	5	2	-0.1111
clerk, office worker	2	0	1	2	0	0.4000
farmer	0	0	0	1	0	-1.0000
college student	18	12	4	4	2	1.0000

TABLE 2A-6

Preference Responses in Terms of Occupation
Composition # 6 Second Concert

F score - .812 - not significant

OCCUPATION	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
college professor	1	1	0	0	1	0.3333
elem./h.s. teacher	2	1	0	0	0	1.6667
musician	1	6	4	0	0	0.7272
other professionals	5	11	1	1	0	1.1111
proprietor, manager	1	2	1	2	0	0.3333
clerk, office worker	2	0	2	1	0	0.6000
farmer	0	1	0	0	0	1.0000
college student	11	21	5	1	2	0.9500

TABLE 2A-7

Preference Responses in Terms of Occupation
Composition # 7 Second Concert

F score - .538 - not significant

OCCUPATION	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
college professor	1	1	-	1	0	0.6667
elem./h.s. teacher	3	0	0	0	0	2.0000
musician	2	5	4	0	0	0.8182
other professionals	3	9	3	2	1	0.6111
proprietor, manager	0	1	5	0	0	0.1667
clerk, office worker	2	0	2	1	0	0.6000
farmer	0	1	0	0	0	1.0000
college student	9	15	9	6	1	0.6250

TABLE 2A-8

Preference Responses in Terms of Occupation
Composition # 8 Second Concert

F score - .682 - not significant

OCCUPATION	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
college professor	1	0	0	2	0	0.0000
elem./h.s. teacher	2	1	0	0	0	1.6667
musician	2	6	3	0	0	0.9091
other professionals	3	9	4	2	0	0.7222
proprietor, manager	0	3	2	0	1	0.1667
clerk, office worker	1	2	2	0	0	0.8000
farmer	0	0	0	1	0	-1.0000
college student	7	15	13	4	1	0.5750

TABLE 2A-9

Preference Responses in Terms of Occupation
Composition # 9 Second Concert

F score - .510 - not significant

OCCUPATION	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
college professor	1	0	0	2	0	0.0000
elem./h.s. teacher	3	0	0	0	0	2.0000
musician	3	5	3	0	0	1.0000

TABLE 2A-9 (continued)

OCCUPATION	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
other professionals	5	9	2	2	0	0.9444
proprietor, manager	1	2	3	0	0	0.6667
clerk, office worker	2	1	1	1	0	0.8000
farmer	0	1	0	0	0	1.0000
college student	11	15	6	7	1	0.7000

TABLE 2A-10

Preference Responses in Terms of Occupation
Composition # 10 Second Concert

F score - 1.057 - significant at the .500 level

OCCUPATION	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
college professor	0	2	1	0	0	0.6667
elem./h.s. teacher	0	0	1	1	1	-1.0000
musician	2	4	4	1	0	0.6364
other professionals	5	9	4	0	0	1.0556
proprietor, manager	1	3	1	0	1	0.5000
clerk, office worker	0	2	2	1	0	0.2000
farmer	0	0	1	0	0	0.0000
college student	7	13	14	6	0	0.5250

TABLE 2A-11

Preference Responses in Terms of Occupation
Composition # 11 Second Concert

F score - .743 - not significant

OCCUPATION	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
college professor	0	2	0	0	1	0.0000
elem./h.s. teacher	0	3	0	0	0	1.0000
musician	1	6	3	1	0	0.6364
other professionals	4	11	2	1	0	1.0000
proprietor, manager	0	2	3	0	1	0.0000
clerk, office worker	0	3	1	1	0	0.4000
farmer	0	0	0	1	0	-1.0000
college student	7	16	13	3	1	0.6250

TABLE 2A-12

Preference Responses in Terms of Occupation
Composition # 12 Second Concert

F score - .779 - not significant

OCCUPATION	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
college professor	0	2	0	1	0	0.3333
elem./h.s teacher	1	0	0	1	1	-0.3333
musician	3	3	4	1	0	0.7273
other professionals	4	11	2	1	0	1.0000
proprietor, manager	0	3	3	0	0	0.5000
clerk, office worker	0	1	3	1	0	0.0000
farmer	0	0	0	1	0	-1.0000
college student	9	15	13	2	1	0.7250

TABLE 2A-13

Preference Responses in Terms of Occupation
Composition # 13 Second Concert

F score - 1.468 - significant at the .750 level

OCCUPATION	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
college professor	1	0	2	0	0	0.6667
elem./h.s. teacher	0	1	0	1	1	-0.6667
musician	2	4	3	2	0	0.5455
other professionals	6	9	3	0	0	1.1667
proprietor, manager	0	1	3	2	0	-0.1667
clerk, office worker	0	2	3	0	0	0.4000
farmer	0	0	1	0	0	0.0000
college student	11	14	12	3	0	0.8250

TABLE 2A-14

Preference Responses in Terms of Occupation
Composition # 14 Second Concert

F score - 1.123 - significant at the .500 level

OCCUPATION	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
college professor	0	1	2	0	0	0.3333
elem./h.s. teacher	1	0	0	2	0	0.0000

TABLE 2A-14 (continued)

OCCUPATION	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
musician	2	3	5	1	0	0.5455
other professionals	7	6	5	0	0	1.1111
proprietor, manager	0	2	3	0	1	0.0000
clerk, office worker	0	3	2	0	0	0.6000
farmer	0	0	0	1	0	-1.0000
college student	9	21	8	1	1	0.9000

TABLE 2A-15

Preference Responses in Terms of Occupation
Composition # 15 Second Concert

F score - .417 - not significant

OCCUPATION	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
college professor	0	1	1	0	1	-0.3333
elem/h.s. teacher	0	2	0	1	0	0.3333
musician	4	3	3	1	0	0.9091
other professionals	4	8	2	3	1	0.6111
proprietor, manager	1	3	0	2	0	0.5000
clerk, office worker	1	0	1	1	2	-0.6000
farmer	0	0	1	0	0	0.0000
college student	11	11	7	4	7	0.3750

TABLE 2A-16

Preference Responses in Terms of Occupation
Composition # 16 Second Concert

F score - .111 - not significant

OCCUPATION	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
college professor	1	1	1	0	0	1.0000
elem./h.s. teacher	1	3	0	0	0	1.2500
musician	6	2	1	1	1	1.0000
other professionals	6	4	8	0	0	0.8889
proprietor, manager	1	3	0	2	0	0.5000
clerk, office worker	2	2	1	0	0	1.2000
farmer	0	1	0	0	0	1.0000
college student	15	16	4	2	3	0.9500

TABLE 2A-17

Preference Responses in Terms of Occupation
Composition # 17 Second Concert

F score - .591 - not significant

OCCUPATION	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
college professor	1	1	0	0	1	0.3333
elem/h.s. teacher	2	0	0	1	0	1.0000
musician	6	3	0	0	2	1.0000
other professionals	3	8	4	2	1	0.5556
proprietor, manager	0	2	0	1	3	-0.8333
clerk, office worker	2	1	0	2	0	0.6000
farmer	0	0	1	0	0	0.0000
college student	16	8	8	4	4	0.7000

Analysis of the data in terms of the independent variable, Age Level. Table 2B indicates the distribution of the auditors forming the sample for the second concert in terms of their Age Level. An examination of the table shows three age groups in which the number of auditors was too small to be of any real value in the analysis of the data, namely, the three groups "46 - 55," "56 - 65," and "66 or over." The date for these three groups was included for general information.

Tables 2B-1 through 2B-17 list the preference responses in terms of age level for each of the 17 compositions performed.

The responses to the Ives' songs produced *F* scores indicating significant differences in four of the five songs. The responses to Composition # 1 (Feldeinsamkeit) with an *F* score of 1.555, significant at the .750 level, did not prove to be of any real significance since the high mean responses of the three oldest age groupings which provided the basis for the significance collectively accounted for only about ten percent of the total sample. (See Table 2B-1.)

The responses to Composition # 2 (Watchman) and Composition # 4 (Thoreau) with *F* scores of 1.212 and 1.169 respectively, both significant at the .500 level, showed similar characteristics. In both sets of responses the mean response of those in the age group

"26 - 35" is significantly higher than the other age level groups which are large enough to be useful statistically. As will be discussed later, both of these compositions elicited similar mood responses, namely, one of a "quiet, lyrical, satisfying, calm" nature. (See Tables 2B-2 and 2B-4).

The most significant F score, 1.979, significant at the .900 level, was found in the responses to Composition # 5 (General Booth etc.). (See Table 2B-5.) The highest mean response was observed in the "21 or under" age level group, with the mean response of each succeeding age level group being correspondingly lower. Stylistically the outstanding characteristic of this song was its use of special rhythmic and melodic effects.

The Four Epitaphs by Takacs did not elicit responses which were significantly different in terms of age level, except in Composition # 7 (Elegie - Debussy). The F score in this case was 1.788, which was significant at the .750 level. It is based on relatively higher mean responses by the "22 - 25" and "26 - 35" age level groups. However, the differences in mean responses between those groups and the other age level groups was not great enough to suggest that the difference would be maintained if the sample was larger. Hence little in the way of significant difference in terms of age level could be observed in the responses to the Takacs piano pieces.

Only one of the Evans' songs elicited responses which proved to be statistically significant. Composition " 14 (Gleich und Gleich) had an F score of 1.960, which was significant at the .900 level. Again the highest mean response was observed in the youngest age level group, with the mean responses of each succeeding age level group being correspondingly lower, with the lowest mean response occurring in the responses of the "26 - 35" age level group. The mean responses then tended to rise again. It is interesting to note that half of the auditors in the "26 - 35" age level group were undecided as to whether or not they had a preference for Composition # 14. The fast, bright tempo of this short song could well be the stylistic characteristic which produced such a response. For a brisk tempo and brevity are the principle characteristics which set this song apart from the others in the Goethe group. (See Table 2B-14).

Of the three instrumental works, only the responses to Composition # 17 (Sydeman - Quintet) produced an F score of any statistical significance. Here the F score was 1.025, significant at the .500 level. The mean responses for all age level groupings, except the two oldest groupings, were similar. The negative mean responses of those 56 and older were based on too small a sample to be of any real value. Hence the difference in responses to Composition # 17 cannot be considered to be of any particular significance. The fact that this composition was stylistically characterized as being "post-Webern pointillism" does raise the suggestion that possibly a trend is in evidence here which could be borne out with a larger sampling. But such a conclusion could not be made on the evidence at hand.

TABLE 2B

Age Levels of Auditors - Second Concert

Age Level	Number
21 or under	33
22 - 25	14
26 - 35	20
36 - 45	111
46 - 55	3
56 - 65	4
66 or over	2
Total	87

TABLE 2B-1

Preference Responses in Terms of Age
Composition # 1 Second Concert

F score - 1.555 - significant at the .750 level

AGE GROUP	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
21 or under	9	19	3	2	0	1.0606
22 - 25	4	7	3	0	0	1.0714
26 - 35	4	12	0	3	1	0.7500
36 - 45	1	7	2	1	0	0.7272
46 - 55	1	1	1	0	0	1.0000
56 - 65	4	0	0	0	0	2.0000
66 or over	2	0	0	0	0	2.0000

TABLE 2B-2

Preference Responses in Terms of Age
Composition # 2 Second Concert

F score - 1.212 - significant at the .500 level

AGE GROUP	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
21 or under	2	15	11	5	0	0.4242
22 - 25	1	6	2	4	1	0.1429
26 - 35	4	11	2	3	0	0.8000
36 - 45	0	5	5	1	0	0.3636
46 - 55	1	0	2	0	0	0.6667
56 - 65	1	3	0	0	0	1.2500
66 or over	0	2	0	0	0	1.0000

TABLE 2B-3

Preference Responses in Terms of Age
Composition # 3 Second Concert

F score - .749 - not significant

AGE GROUP	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
21 or under	7	11	10	4	1	0.5758
22 - 25	3	4	3	3	1	0.3571
26 - 35	4	7	6	3	0	0.6000
36 - 45	0	5	2	4	0	0.0909
46 - 55	0	1	0	2	0	-0.3333
56 - 65	0	3	1	0	0	0.7500
66 or over	0	2	0	0	0	1.0000

TABLE 2B-4

Preference Responses in Terms of Age
Composition # 4 Second Concert

F score - 1.169 - significant at the .500 level

AGE GROUP	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
21 or under	2	15	13	3	0	0.4848
22 - 25	1	8	3	0	2	0.4286
26 - 35	4	12	3	1	0	0.9500
36 - 45	0	5	4	2	0	0.2727
46 - 55	0	1	1	1	0	0.0000
56 - 65	0	2	2	0	0	0.5000
66 or over	0	2	0	0	0	1.0000

TABLE 2B-5

Preference Responses in Terms of Age
Composition # 5 Second Concert

F score - 1.979 - significant at the .900 level

AGE GROUP	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
21 or under	15	10	4	3	1	1.0606
22 - 25	7	3	1	2	1	0.9286
26 - 35	7	5	2	5	1	0.6000
36 - 45	3	3	1	4	0	0.4545
46 - 55	1	0	0	2	0	0.0000
56 - 65	0	0	2	0	2	-1.0000
66 or over	0	1	1	0	0	0.5000

TABLE 2B-6

Preference Responses in Terms of Age
Composition # 6 Second Concert

F score - .813 - not significant

AGE GROUP	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
21 or under	8	18	5	1	1	0.9394
22 - 25	7	2	3	1	1	0.9286
26 - 35	5	11	2	1	1	0.9000
36 - 45	2	6	2	1	0	0.8182
46 - 55	0	1	1	1	0	0.0000
56 - 65	1	3	0	0	0	1.2500
66 or over	0	1	0	1	0	0.0000

TABLE 2B-7

Preference Responses in Terms of Age
Composition # 7 Second Concert

F score - 1.788 - significant at the .750 level

AGE GROUP	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
21 or under	7	11	9	6	0	0.5758
22 - 25	6	4	2	1	1	0.9286
26 - 35	6	9	4	1	0	1.0000
36 - 45	1	5	4	0	1	0.4545
46 - 55	0	1	2	0	0	0.3333
56 - 65	0	2	2	0	0	0.5000
66 or over	0	0	0	2	0	-1.0000

TABLE 2B-8

Preference Responses in Terms of Age
Composition # 8   Second Concert

F score - .329 - not significant

AGE GROUP	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
21 or under	6	12	11	4	0	0.6061
22 - 25	5	4	4	0	1	0.8571
26 - 35	4	9	4	2	1	0,6500
36 - 45	1	6	3	1	0	0.6364
46 - 55	0	2	1	0	0	0.6667
56 - 65	0	2	1	1	0	0.2500
66 or over	0	1	0	1	0	0.0000

TABLE 2B-9

Preference Responses in Terms of Age
Composition # 9   Second Concert

F score - .579 - not significant

AGE GROUP	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
21 or under	9	11	6	7	0	0.6667
22 - 25	5	6	1	1	1	0.9286
26 - 35	8	6	5	1	0	1.0500
36 - 45	3	6	1	1	0	1.0000
46 - 55	0	2	1	0	0	0.6667
46 - 65	1	1	1	1	0	0.5000
66 or over	0	1	0	1	0	0.0000

TABLE 2B-10

Preference Responses in Terms of Age
Composition # 10   Second Concert

F score - .506 - not significant

AGE GROUP	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
21 or under	5	12	11	5	0	0.5152
22 - 25	4	4	3	3	0	0.6429
26 - 35	3	7	8	1	1	0.5000
36 - 45	1	4	5	0	1	0.3636
46 - 55	0	3	0	0	0	1.0000
56 - 65	1	2	1	0	0	1.0000
66 or over	1	1	0	0	0	1.5000

TABLE 2B-11

Preference Responses in Terms of Age
Composition # 11 Second Concert

F score - .355 - not significant

AGE GROUP	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
21 or under	6	12	12	2	1	0.6061
22 - 25	2	9	1	2	0	0.7875
26 - 35	1	11	5	2	1	0.4500
36 - 45	2	5	2	1	1	0.5455
46 - 55	0	1	2	0	0	0.3333
56 - 65	1	3	0	0	0	1.2500
66 or over	0	2	0	0	0	1.0000

TABLE 2B-12

Preference Responses in Terms of Age
Composition # 12 Second Concert

F score - .683 - not significant

AGE GROUP	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
21 or under	6	14	11	2	0	0.7273
22 - 25	5	3	4	1	1	0.7143
26 - 35	2	10	3	4	1	0.4000
36 - 45	2	2	6	1	0	0.4545
46 - 55	0	2	1	0	0	0.6667
56 - 65	2	2	0	0	0	1.5000
66 or over	0	2	0	0	0	1.0000

TABLE 2B-13

Preference Responses in Terms of Age
Composition # 13 Second Concert

F score - .865 - not significant

AGE GROUP	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
21 or under	9	11	11	2	0	0.8182
22 - 25	4	5	2	3	0	0.7143
26 - 35	3	6	9	1	1	0.4500
36 - 45	1	5	4	1	0	0.5455
46 - 55	0	2	0	1	0	0.3333
56 - 65	2	1	1	0	0	1.2500
66 or over	1	1	0	0	0	1.5000

TABLE 2B-14

Preference Responses in Terms of Age
Composition # 14 Second Concert

F score - 1.960 - significant at the .900 level

AGE GROUP	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
21 or under	8	19	5	0	1	1.0000
22 - 25	3	7	3	1	0	0.8571
26 - 35	2	5	10	2	1	0.2500
36 - 45	3	1	6	0	1	0.4545
46 - 55	0	2	1	0	0	0.6667
56 - 65	1	3	0	0	0	1.2500
66 or over	1	1	0	0	0	1.5000

TABLE 2B-15

Preference Responsts in Terms of Age
Composition # 15 Second Concert

F score - .827 - not significant

AGE GROUP	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
21 or under	10	10	4	2	7	0.4242
22 - 25	4	2	5	2	1	0.4286
26 - 35	2	12	3	3	0	0.6500
36 - 45	2	4	2	2	1	0.3636
46 - 55	2	0	0	1	0	1.0000
56 - 65	1	0	0	2	1	-0.5000
66 or over	0	0	1	0	1	-1.0000

TABLE 2B-16

Preference Responses in Terms of Age
Composition # 16 Second Concert

F score - .538 - not significant

AGE GROUP	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
21 or under	12	15	2	2	2	1.0000
22 - 25	6	3	2	1	2	0.7143
26 - 35	6	5	7	2	0	0.7500
36 - 45	3	7	1	0	0	1.1818
46 - 55	2	1	0	0	0	1.6667
56 - 65	1	1	2	0	0	0.7500
66 or over	1	0	1	0	0	1.0000

TABLE 2B-17

Preference Responses in Terms of Age
Composition # 17 Second Concert

F score - 1.025 - significant at the .500 level

AGE GROUP	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
21 or under	12	8	6	4	3	0.6667
22 - 25	8	1	2	0	3	0.7857
26 - 35	6	8	2	3	1	0.7500
36 - 45	3	4	1	1	2	0.4545
46 - 55	1	1	0	1	0	0.6667
56 - 65	0	1	2	0	1	-0.2500
66 or over	0	0	0	1	1	-1.5000

Analysis of the data in terms of the independent variable, Music Training. Table 2C indicates the distribution of the auditors forming the sample for the Second Concert in terms of their formal music training. While the majority of the auditors were grouped in the first three categories, the distribution of the sample is such that all categories were large enough to be of significance in a statistical treatment of the data.

Tables 2C-1 through 2C-17 list the preference responses in terms of formal music training for each of the 17 compositions performed.

As indicated in the analysis of the data of the first concert, in terms of music training, the responses to the compositions of the second concert tend to indicate a pattern of response. Generally, the mean responses of the five categories tend to form a curve with the apex being the mean responses of those in Category IV, and the lowest mean responses being from those in Category I and Category V. There were some deviations from this pattern evident in the mean responses to the compositions performed at the Second Concert, such deviations resulting from the responses by those auditors who formed Category III. Even considering this deviation in the tendency for the mean responses to follow a general pattern is of significance within itself.

The responses to the first three song of Ives were not statistically significant. However, the mean responses for Composition # 1 (Feldeinsamkeit) and Composition # 3 (The Cage) have a similar pattern. The highest mean response came from the auditors forming Category IV. In both cases the mean response for Category III is lower than for Category II, the deviation mentioned in the preceding paragraph. The differences between the mean responses of the five categories for Composition # 2 (Watchman) were so slight that little can be surmised from a study of that data.

The F score for Composition # 4 (Thoreau) was 1.042, which is significant at the .500 level. The low mean response of those in Category III provided the basis for the significant difference. Again this points up the deviation previously mentioned.

The first truly significant difference occurred in the responses to Composition # 5 (General Booth etc.). The F score was 4.200, significant at the .995 level, the highest level of significance. Here the curve formed by the mean responses was quite evident. The negative mean response by those in Category I readily pointed up the significant difference in the responses when compared with the mean responses of the other four categories.

The responses to only one of the four piano pieces by Takacs provided a basis for statistical significance, and it was of limited significance. The F score for Composition # 6 (Praeludium - for Hindemuth) was .987, significant at the .500 level. The significance was based on the lower mean responses of Categories II and V, in comparison with the mean responses of the other three categories.

The responses to four of the five settings of Goethe poems by Evans were significantly different. For Composition # 11 (Dem aufgehenden Vollmonde) the F score was 1.732, significant at the .750 level. For Composition # 12 (Finnisches Lied) the F score was 1.618, also significant at the .750 level. The F score for Composition # 13 (Im Vorubergehen) was 2.874, significant at the .950 level. Also significant at the .950 level was the F score for Composition # 14 (Gleich und Gleich), 2.673. In each case the lowest mean responses occurred in Categories I and V, with the mean responses for all five categories tending to form a curve with the apex at Category IV.

Thus a pattern of response in terms of music training was readily evident in the set of Evans' songs. Stylistically the songs were somewhat similar. The pattern of responses therefore tended to indicate that formal music training did affect the manner in which an auditor will respond to a music composition.

The F score for Composition # 15 (Mennin Sonata) was .976, significant at the .500 level. The negative mean response for Category I (those with no formal music training) did differ significantly when compared with the uniform mean responses of the other four categories.

For Composition # 16 (Kingman quintet) the F score was 1.494, significant at the .750 level. Here the curve of mean responses is present, although not as well defined, since the mean response of Category I is much higher than the mean response of Category V. The mean response curve was also evident in the responses to Composition # 17 (Sydeman quintet), although the differences in the mean responses of the various categories were not statistically significant.

Thus it was noted, in examining the responses in terms of music training, that there was a definite tendency for the probability of more extensive formal music training producing a more favorable preference response up to a point. The exception being that those with the highest degree of formal music training would not be so likely to respond as favorably as those with less training.

TABLE 2C

Music Training of Auditors - Second Concert

MUSIC TRAINING CATEGORY	NUMBER
I	19
II	24
III	22
IV	10
V	12
Total	87

TABLE 2C-1

Preference Responses in Terms of Music Training
Composition # 1 Second Concert

F score - .000 - not significant

MUSIC TRAINING CATEGORY	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
I	3	13	3	0	0	1.0000
II	10	8	5	1	0	1.1250
III	6	11	1	4	0	0.8636
IV	3	7	0	0	0	1.3000
V	3	7	0	1	1	0.8333

TABLE 2C-2

Preference Responses in Terms of Music Training
Composition # 2 Second Concert

F score - .288 - not significant

MUSIC TRAINING CATEGORY	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
I	4	6	6	3	0	0.5789
II	0	18	4	2	0	0.6667
III	3	9	6	4	0	0.5000
IV	1	3	4	2	0	0.3000
V	1	6	2	2	1	0.3333

TABLE 2C-3

Preference Responses in Terms of Music Training
Composition # 3 Second Concert

F score - .445 - not significant

MUSIC TRAINING CATEGORY	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
I	2	7	5	5	0	0.3158
II	2	11	6	3	0	0.6667
III	4	7	6	4	1	0.4091
IV	3	3	2	2	0	0.7000
V	1	5	3	2	1	0.2500

TABLE 2C-4

Preference Responses in Terms of Music Training
Composition # 4 Second Concert

F score - 1.042 - significant at the .500 level

MUSIC TRAINING CATEGORY	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
I	0	11	6	2	0	0.4737
II	3	14	6	1	0	0.7917
III	1	11	5	4	1	0.3182
IV	1	4	5	0	0	0.6000
V	2	5	4	0	1	0.5833

TABLE 2C-5

Preference Responses in Terms of Music Training
Composition # 5 Second Concert

F score - 4.200 - significant at the .995 level

MUSIC TRAINING CATEGORY	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
I	3	2	3	9	2	-0.2632
II	9	6	6	2	1	0.8333
III	10	7	0	4	1	0.9545
IV	5	3	2	0	0	1.3000
V	6	4	0	1	1	1.0833

TABLE 2C-6

Preference Responses in Terms of Music Training
Composition # 6 Second Concert

F score - .987 - significant at the .500 level

MUSIC TRAINING CATEGORY	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
I	7	7	2	3	0	0.9474
II	5	12	5	1	1	0.7917
III	4	14	3	1	0	0.9545
IV	4	4	2	0	0	1.2000
V	3	5	1	1	2	0.5000

TABLE 2C-7

Preference Responses in Terms of Music Training
Composition # 7 Second Concert

F score - .683 - not significant

MUSIC TRAINING CATEGORY	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
I	5	5	7	1	1	0.6316
II	3	10	6	5	0	0.4583
III	6	8	5	3	0	0.7727
IV	3	4	3	0	0	1.0000
V	3	5	2	1	1	0.6667

TABLE 2C-8

Preference Responses in Terms of Music Training
Composition # 8 Second Concert

F score - .250 - not significant

MUSIC TRAINING CATEGORY	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
I	2	9	5	3	0	0.5263
II	5	9	8	2	0	0.7083
III	3	11	4	4	0	0.5909
IV	3	1	6	0	0	0.7000
V	3	6	1	0	2	0.6667

TABLE 2C-9

Preference Responses in Terms of Music Training
Composition # 9 Second Concert

F score - .215 - not significant

MUSIC TRAINING CATEGORY	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
I	5	8	3	3	0	0.7895
II	6	9	6	3	0	0.7500
III	7	8	2	5	0	0.7727
IV	4	3	2	1	0	1.0000
V	4	5	2	0	1	0.9167

TABLE 2C-10

Preference Responses in Terms of Music Training
Composition # 10 Second Concert

F score - .253 - not significant

MUSIC TRAINING CATEGORY	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
I	2	8	7	1	1	0.4737
II	4	10	7	3	0	0.6250
III	3	9	8	2	0	0.5909
IV	3	3	3	1	0	0.8000
V	3	3	3	2	1	0.4167

TABLE 2C-11

Preference Responses in Terms of Music Training
Composition # 11 Second Concert

F score - 1.732 - significant at the .750 level

MUSIC TRAINING CATEGORY	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
I	1	8	5	3	2	0.1579
II	4	13	5	1	1	0.7500
III	3	11	8	0	0	0.7727
IV	3	4	2	1	0	0.9000
V	1	7	2	2	0	0.5833

TABLE 2C-12

Preference Responses in Terms of Music Training
Composition # 12 Second Concert

F score - 1.618 - significant at the .750 level

MUSIC TRAINING CATEGORY	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
I	2	8	6	3	0	0.4737
II	4	10	8	2	0	0.6667
III	5	10	5	2	0	0.8182
IV	3	6	1	0	0	1.2000
V	3	1	5	1	2	0.1667

TABLE 2C-13

Preference Responses in Terms of Music Training
Composition # 13 Second Concert

F score - 2.847 - significant at the .950 level

MUSIC TRAINING CATEGORY	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
I	2	5	9	3	0	0.3158
II	7	10	5	2	0	0.9167
III	6	9	7	0	0	0.9545
IV	2	6	2	0	0	1.0000
V	3	1	4	3	1	0.1667

TABLE 2C-14

Preference Responses in Terms of Music Training
Composition # 14 Second Concert

F score - 2.673 - significant at the .950 level

MUSIC TRAINING CATEGORY	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
I	1	8	8	1	1	0.3684
II	9	7	7	1	0	1.0000
III	3	15	4	0	0	0.9545
IV	4	4	1	0	1	1.0000
V	1	4	5	1	1	0.2500

TABLE 2C-15

Preference Responses in Terms of Music Training
Composition # 15 Second Concert

F score - .976 - significant at the .500 level

MUSIC TRAINING CATEGORY	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
I	2	6	3	4	4	-0.1053
II	6	9	5	1	3	0.5833
III	6	8	3	2	3	0.5455
IV	3	2	3	1	1	0.5000
V	4	3	1	4	0	0.5833

TABLE 2C-16

Preference Responses in Terms of Music Training
Composition # 16 Second Concert

F score - 1.494 - significant at the .750 level

MUSIC TRAINING CATEGORY	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
I	4	10	5	0	0	0.9474
II	10	5	6	2	1	0.8750
III	7	11	3	1	0	1.0909
IV	6	3	0	1	0	1.4000
V	4	3	1	1	3	0.3333

TABLE 2C-17

Preference Responses in Terms of Music Training
Composition # 17 Second Concert

F score - .246 - not significant

MUSIC TRAINING CATEGORY	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
I	4	7	3	1	4	0.3158
II	9	5	5	2	3	0.6250
III	7	6	4	5	0	0.6818
IV	5	2	0	2	1	0.8000
V	5	3	1	0	3	0.5833

Analysis of the data in terms of the independent variable, Educational Attainment. Table 2D indicates the distribution of the auditors forming the sample for the Second Concert in terms of the Educational Attainment. Any conclusions pertaining to the analysis of data in terms of Educational Attainment for the Second Concert will be limited. For only two groups of auditors, "attended college, didn't graduate" and "college graduates" were large enough to contribute substantially to the analysis of the data.

Tables 2D-1 through 2D-17 list the preference responses in terms of Educational Attainment for each of the 17 compositions performed.

Only the responses to Composition # 17 (Sydeman quintet) produced significantly different mean responses and distributions of responses along the preference scale between the "attended college, didn't graduate" and the "college graduate" groups. Here those in the "attended college, didn't graduate" group had a higher ratio of favorable responses to unfavorable responses than did the "college graduate" group. (See Table 2D-17.) The Sydeman quintet, stylistically an example of post-Webern pointillism, was received more favorably by those in the "attended college, didn't graduate" group.

For the other 16 compositions any significant statistical difference was based on the mean responses of the other four groupings of Educational Attainment. Since the size of each of the other four groups was too small to be of real value, any resultant significant difference was considered to be of no real practical significance and was disregarded.

TABLE 2D

Educational Attainment of Auditors - Second Concert

Educational Attainment	Number
att. h.s., didn't grad.	2
high school graduate	3
att. coll., didn't grad.	41
college graduate	28
received master's degree	7
received doctor's degree	6
Total	87

TABLE 2D-1

Preference Responses in Terms of Educational Attainment
Composition # 1 Second Concert

F score - 1.555 - significant at the .750 level

EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
att. h.s., didn't grad,	0	0	1	1	0	-0.5000
high school graduate	0	1	1	1	0	0.0000
att. coll., didn't grad.	13	22	3	3	0	1.0976
college graduate	9	14	3	1	1	1.0357
received master's degree	1	5	1	0	0	1.0000
received doctor's degree	2	4	0	0	0	1.3333

TABLE 2D-2

Preference Responses in Terms of Educational Attainment
Composition # 2 Second Concert

F score - .579 - not significant

EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
att. h.s., didn't grad.	0	1	1	0	0	0.5000
high school graduate	0	1	2	0	0	0.3333
att. coll., didn't grad.	4	16	14	7	0	0.4146
college graduate	2	16	4	5	1	0.4643
received master's degree	3	2	1	1	0	1.0000
received doctor's degree	0	6	0	0	0	1.0000

TABLE 2D-3

Preference Responses in Terms of Educational Attainment
Composition # 3 Second Concert

F score - 1.411 - significant at the .750 level

EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
att. h.s., didn't grad.	1	0	1	0	0	1.0000
high school graduate	0	0	0	3	0	-1.0000
att. coll., didn't grad.	7	14	12	7	1	0.4634
college graduate	3	13	6	5	1	0.4286
received master's degree	2	3	1	1	0	0.8571
received doctor's degree	1	3	2	0	0	0.8333

TABLE 2D-4

Preference Responses in Terms of Educational Attainment
Composition # 4 Second Concert

F score - 1.696 - significant at the .750 level

EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
att. h.s., didn't grad.	0	1	1	0	0	0.5000
high school graduate	0	1	1	1	0	0.0000
att. coll., didn't grad.	2	16	17	5	1	0.3171
college graduate	2	19	5	1	1	0.7143
received master's degree	3	2	2	0	0	1.1429
received doctor's degree	0	6	0	0	0	1.0000

TABLE 2D-5

Preference Responses in Terms of Educational Attainment
Composition # 5 Second Concert

F score - .567 - not significant

EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
att. h.s., didn't grad.	1	0	1	0	0	1.0000
high school graduate	0	2	0	0	1	0.0000
att. coll.,didn't grad.	18	11	4	7	1	0.9268
college graduate	8	7	5	5	3	0.4286
received master's degree	3	1	1	2	0	0.7143
received doctor's degree	2	3	0	0	1	0.8333

TABLE 2D-6

Preference Responses in Terms of Educational Attainment
Composition # 6 Second Concert

F score - .813 - not significant

EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
att. h.s., didn't grad.	0	1	1	0	0	0.5000
high school graduate	1	0	2	0	0	0.6667
att. coll., didn't grad.	10	23	6	2	0	1.0000
college graduate	9	12	3	2	2	0.8571
received master's degree	2	4	0	1	0	1.0000
received doctor's degree	1	2	1	1	1	0.1667

TABLE 2D-7

Preference Responses in Terms of Educational Attainment
Composition # 7 Second Concert

F score - .599 - not significant

EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
att. h.s., didn't grad.	0	1	1	0	0	0.5000
high school graduate	1	0	2	0	0	0.5000
att. coll., didn't grad.	9	14	13	5	0	0.6585
college graduate	6	11	5	4	2	0.5357
received master's degree	3	3	1	0	0	1.2857
received doctor's degree	1	3	1	1	0	0.6667

TABLE 2D-8

Preference Responses in Terms of Educational Attainment
Composition # 8 Second Concert

F score - .675 - not significant

EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
att. h.s., didn't grad.	0	1	1	0	0	0.5000
high school graduate	0	1	2	0	0	0.3333
att. coll.,didn't grad.	7	17	13	4	0	0.6585
college graduate	5	11	7	3	2	0.5000
received master's degree	2	5	0	0	0	1.2857
received doctor's degree	2	1	1	2	0	0.5000

TABLE 2C-9

Preference Responses in Terms of Educational Attainment
Composition # 9 Second Concert

F score - .579 - not significant

EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
att. h.s., didn't grad.	1	0	1	0	0	1.0000
high school graduate	1	2	0	0	0	1.3333
att. coll.,didn't grad.	9	17	7	8	0	0.6585
college graduate	9	10	6	2	1	0.8571
received master's degree	4	2	1	0	0	1.4286
received doctor's degree	2	2	0	2	0	0.6667

TABLE 2D-10

Preference Responses in Terms of Educational Attainment
Composition # 10 Second Concert

F score - .333 - not significant

EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
att. h.s., did't grad.	0	0	1	1	0	-0.5000
high school graduate	0	2	1	0	0	0.6667
att. coll.,didn't grad.	6	17	13	5	0	0.5854
college graduate	8	7	9	2	2	0.6071
received master's degree	1	3	2	1	0	0.5714
received doctor's degree	0	4	2	0	0	0.6667

TABLE 2D-11

Preference Responses in Terms of Educational Attainment
Composition # 11 Second Concert

F score - .000 - not significant

EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
att. h.s., didn't grad.	0	0	2	0	0	0.0000
high school graduate	0	2	1	0	0	0.6667
att. coll.,didn't grad.	6	18	13	3	1	0.6098
college graduate	4	17	3	3	1	0.7143
received master's degree	1	3	2	1	0	0.5714
received doctor's degree	1	3	1	0	1	0.5000

TABLE 2D-12

Preference Responses in Terms of Educational Attainment
Composition # 12 Second Concert

F score - .506 - not significant

EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
att. h.s., didn't grad.	1	0	1	0	0	1.0000
high school graduate	0	0	2	1	0	-0.3333
att. coll.,didn't grad.	8	18	13	2	0	0.7805
college graduate	6	11	6	3	2	0.5714
received master's degree	2	2	2	1	0	0.7143
received doctor's degree	0	4	1	1	0	0.5000

TABLE 2D-13

Preference Responses in Terms of Educational Attainment
Composition # 13 Second Concert

F score - .164 - not significant

EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
att. h.s., didn't grad.	1	0	1	0	0	1.0000
high school graduate	0	1	2	0	0	0.3333
att. coll.,didn't grad.	10	14	13	4	0	0.7317
college graduate	6	11	7	3	1	0.6429
received master's degree	2	3	1	1	0	0.8571
received doctor's degree	1	2	3	0	0	0.6667

TABLE 2D-14

Preference Responses in Terms of Educational Attainment
Composition # 14 Second Concert

F score - .350 - not significant

EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
att. h.s., didn't grad.	1	0	1	0	0	1.0000
high school graduate	0	1	2	0	0	0.3333
att. coll.,didn't grad.	8	22	9	1	1	0.8537
college graduate	7	11	7	1	2	0.7143
received master's degree	1	3	2	1	0	0.5714
received doctor's degree	1	1	4	0	0	0.5000

TABLE 2D-15

Preference Responses in Terms of Educational Attainment
Composition # 15 Second Concert

F score - 1.333 - significant at the .750 level

EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
att. h.s., didn't grad.	1	1	0	0	0	1.5000
high school graduate	0	1	0	1	1	-0.5000
att. coll.,didn't grad.	10	10	10	3	8	0.2683
college graduate	5	10	4	8	1	0.3571
received master's degree	3	4	0	0	0	1.4286
received doctor's degree	2	2	1	0	1	0.6667

TABLE 2D-16

Preference Responses in Terms of Educational Attainment
Composition # 16 Second Concert

F score - .824 - not significant

EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
att. h.s.,didn't grad.	2	0	0	0	0	2.0000
high school graduate	1	2	0	0	0	1.3333
att. coll.,didn't grad.	16	16	5	2	2	1.0243
college graduate	8	9	6	3	2	0.6429
received master's degree	3	3	1	0	0	1.2857
received doctor's degree	1	2	3	0	0	0.6667

TABLE 2D-17

Preference Responses in Terms of Educational Attainment
Composition # 17 Second Concert

F score - 1.025 - significant at the .500 level

EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
att. h.s., didn't grad.	2	0	0	0	0	2.0000
high school graduate	1	0	0	1	1	-0.3333
att. coll.,didn't grad.	15	11	6	6	3	0.7073
college graduate	6	9	6	1	6	0.2857
received master's degree	4	1	1	1	0	1.1429
received doctor's degree	2	2	0	1	1	0.5000

Analysis of the data in terms of the independent variable, Familiarity. Tables 2E-1 through 2E-17 list the preference responses to the Familiarity Scale for the 17 compositions of the Second Concert. It should be noted that, in each case except one, the distribution was heavily skewed towards the auditors expressing a feeling of unfamiliarity with the composition. (The one exception was Composition # 1 (Ives - Feldeinsamkeit) where only approximately two-thirds of the auditors expressed a feeling of unfamiliarity.) Thus, any conclusions drawn as a result of the statistical analysis must be viewed with caution. One important conclusion can be made, namely, that the auditors forming the sample were generally unfamiliar with the music performed at the Second Concert.

With regard to Composition # 1, the F score of 3.387, was significant at the .975 level. In this case it was interesting to note that those who were "not sure" or who were "unfamiliar" with the composition responded more favorably than did those who indicated they were "familiar" with the composition.

With the other four Ives' songs, the opposite occurred. Where a statistical significant difference did occur, those expressing "familiarity" responded more favorably to the compositions than did those indicating "unfamiliarity." The statistical significant differences, however, had little value other than to indicate a trend which could be significant, due to the preponderance of "unfamiliar" responses. (See Tables 2E-1 through 2E-5.)

The same tendency was observed in the responses to the four piano pieces by Takacs. Those indicating "familiarity" tended to respond more favorably. (See Tables 2E-6 through 2E-9.)

However, the opposite effect was present in the responses to the five Goethe songs by Evans. Here those indicating "unfamiliarity" tended to respond more favorably than did those who expressed a feeling of "familiarity." (The reaction here was similar to the responses to Composition # 1.) Again the responses were so heavily skewed towards "unfamiliarity" that any statistical significant difference had little real value. It should be mentioned though, that this effect was noted only in the case of compositions using the solo voice and stylistically being characterized as having lyric melody. (See Tables 2E-10 through 2E-14.)

In the responses to the three instrumental works, those indicating "familiarity" or "not sure" tended to respond more favorably than did those who expressed "unfamiliarity" with the compositions. This is the reaction which one might most logically expect to occur. (See Tables 2E-15 through 2E-17.)

TABLE 2E-1

Preference Responses in Terms of Familiarity
Composition # 1 Second Concert

F score - 3.387 - significant at the .975 level

DEGREE OF FAMILIARITY	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
Familiar A (20)	2	13	2	2	1	0.6500
Not sure B (10)	5	5	0	0	0	1.5000
Unfamiliar C (57)	18	28	7	4	0	1.0526

TABLE 2E-2

Preference Responses in Terms of Familiarity
Composition # 2 Second Concert

F score - 1.200 - significant at the .500 level

DEGREE OF FAMILIARITY	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
Familiar A (12)	4	4	2	2	0	0.8333
Not sure B (5)	0	1	3	1	0	0.0000
Unfamiliar C (70)	5	37	17	10	1	0.5000

TABLE 2E-3

Preference Responses in Terms of Familiarity
Composition # 3 Second Concert

F score - 1.866 - significant at the .750 level

DEGREE OF FAMILIARITY	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
Familiar A (7)	1	4	0	2	0	0.4286
Not sure B (5)	3	1	1	0	0	1.4000
Unfamiliar C (75)	10	28	21	14	2	0.4000

TABLE 2E-4

Preference Responses in Terms of Familiarity
Composition # 4 Second Concert

F score - .000 - not significant

DEGREE OF FAMILIARITY	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
Familiar A (11)	2	4	3	2	0	0.5455
Not sure B (6)	0	5	1	0	0	0.8333
Unfamiliar C (70)	5	36	22	5	2	0.5287

TABLE 2E-5

Preference Responses in Terms of Familiarity
Composition # 5 Second Concert

F score - 3.065 - significant at the .900 level

DEGREE OF FAMILIARITY	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
Familiar A (12)	6	6	0	0	0	1.5000
Not sure B (8)	3	1	4	0	0	0.8750
Unfamiliar C (67)	24	15	7	16	5	0.5522

TABLE 2E-6

Preference Responses in Terms of Familiarity
Composition # 6 Second Concert

F score - .988 - significant at the .500 level

DEGREE OF FAMILIARITY	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
Familiar A (8)	4	2	2	0	0	1.2500
Not sure B (4)	2	0	2	0	0	1.0000
Unfamiliar C (75)	17	40	9	6	3	0.8267

TABLE 2E-7

Preference Responses in Terms of Familiarity
Composition # 7 Second Concert

F score - 2.896 - significant at the .900 level

DEGREE OF FAMILIARITY	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
Familiar A (8)	5	1	2	0	0	1.3750
Not sure B (6)	1	3	2	0	0	0.8333
Unfamiliar C (73)	14	28	19	10	2	0.5753

TABLE 2E-8

Preference Responses in Terms of Familiarity
Composition # 8 Second Concert

F score - 3.868 - significant at the .975 level

DEGREE OF FAMILIARITY	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
Familiar A (7)	4	3	0	0	0	1.5714
Not sure B (5)	1	2	2	0	0	0.8000
Unfamiliar C (75)	11	31	22	9	2	0.5333

TABLE 2E-9

Preference Responses in Terms of Familiarity
Composition # 9 Second Concert

F score - 1.354 - significant at the .500 level

DEGREE OF FAMILIARITY	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
Familiar A (11)	5	5	0	1	0	1.2727
Not sure B (4)	1	1	1	1	0	0.5000
Unfamiliar C (72)	20	27	14	10	1	0.7639

TABLE 2E-10

Preference Responses in Terms of Familiarity
Composition # 10 Second Concert

F score - 3.315 - significant at the .950 level

DEGREE OF FAMILIARITY	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
Familiar A (9)	1	2	4	1	1	0.1111
Not sure B (5)	2	3	0	0	0	1.4000
Unfamiliar C (73)	12	28	24	8	1	0.5753

TABLE 2E-11

Preference Responses in Terms of Familiarity
Composition # 11 Second Concert

F score - .000 - not significant

DEGREE OF FAMILIARITY	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
Familiar A (8)	0	6	1	1	0	0.6250
Not sure B (2)	0	2	0	0	0	1.0000
Unfamiliar C (77)	12	35	21	6	3	0.6104

TABLE 2E-12

Preference Responses in Terms of Familiarity
Composition # 12 Second Concert

F score - .000 - not significant

DEGREE OF FAMILIARITY	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
Familiar A (8)	2	2	3	0	1	0.5000
Not sure B (3)	0	1	2	0	0	0.3333
Unfamiliar C (76)	15	32	20	8	1	0.6842

TABLE 2E-13

Preference Responses in Terms of Familiarity
Composition # 13 Second Concert

F score - 3.315 - significant at the .950 level

DEGREE OF FAMILIARITY	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
Familiar A (7)	1	2	2	1	1	0.1429
Not sure B (7)	4	1	2	0	0	1.2857
Unfamiliar C (73)	15	28	23	7	0	0.6986

TABLE 2E-14

Preference Responses in Terms of Familiarity
Composition # 14 Second Concert

F score - 8.400 - significant at the .995 level

DEGREE OF FAMILIARITY	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
Familiar A (6)	0	0	4	0	2	-0.6667
Not sure B (4)	1	1	2	0	0	0.7500
Unfamiliar C (77)	17	37	19	3	1	0.8571

TABLE 2E-15

Preference Responses in Terms of Familiarity
Composition # 15 Second Concert

F score - 4.168 - significant at the .975 level

DEGREE OF FAMILIARITY	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
Familiar A (8)	4	0	1	1	2	0.3750
Not sure B (6)	4	1	0	1	0	1.3333
Unfamiliar C (73)	13	27	14	10	9	0.3378

TABLE 2E-16

Preference Responses in Terms of Familiarity
Composition # 16 Second Concert

F score - 4.382 - significant at the .975 level

DEGREE OF FAMILIARITY	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
Familiar A (5)	1	4	0	0	0	1.2000
Not sure B (7)	3	2	1	0	1	0.8571
Unfamiliar C (75)	27	26	14	5	3	0.9200

TABLE 2E-17

Preference Responses in Terms of Familiarity
Composition # 17 Second Concert

F score - 2.100 - significant at the .750 level

DEGREE OF FAMILIARITY	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
Familiar A (5)	4	1	0	0	0	1.8000
Not sure B (4)	1	1	1	1	0	0.5000
Unfamiliar C (78)	25	21	12	9	11	0.5128

Analysis of the data in terms of preference responses. Table 2F contains the summary of preference responses to each composition. The value of the t test is more apparent in analyzing the preference responses of the compositions performed at the Second Concert. For there were groupings of short works by one composer, and the opportunity was present to examine the preference responses to see if any significant difference in response did occur between several compositions by the same composer.

In comparing the preference responses to Composition # 1 (Feldeinsamkeit) with the responses to the other four songs by Ives, the resultant t values indicated significant differences. Between Composition # 1 and Composition # 2 (Watchman) the t score was 3.466, significant at the .995 level; for Compositions # 1 and # 3 (The Cage) the t score was 3.671, also significant at the .995 level; for Compositions # 1 and # 4 (Thoreau) the t score was 3.280, again significant at the .995 level. Between Compositions # 1 and # 5 (General Booth etc.) the significant difference was not quite as great, the t value being 1.898, significant at the .950 level. An examination of the mean preference responses for each of the compositions mentioned also pointed out that the difference in responses between Compositions # 1 and # 5 was not as great as between Composition # 1 and the other three songs.

The difference in preference responses between Composition # 5 and the other four songs was also significant, although not as great as in the case of Composition # 1. Between Compositiom # 5 and # 2, the t score was 1.228, significant at the .750 level; between # 5 and # 3, the t score was 1.476, significant at the .900 level; and between # 5 and # 4, the t value was 1.030, also significant at the .750 level.

There was no significant difference in the responses between compositions # 2, # 3, and # 4. Between # 2 and # 3, the t score was .310; between # 2 and # 4, the t score was .240; and between # 3 and # 4, the t score was .548, with none of the t values being significant. The lack of statistical significance did not indicate that the responses were similar, merely that they were not significantly different.

Stylistically Composition # 1 (Feldeinsamkeit) was quite traditional, having no relationship to twentieth century styles. On the other hand, Composition # 5 (General Booth etc.) was quite dissonant, percussive and metrically irregular, suggesting more of the stylistic concepts of the twentieth century. Its use of gospel song and piantistic "sound effects" intended to remind one of a bass drum and snare drum, stressed the idea of special effects to carry out the textual idea of the song.

The stylistic differences of the other three compositions were less obvious. They tended to be more consonant, utilizing traditional harmonies (except Composition # 3 which used quartal sonorities throughout) with melodic distortion and other effects which did not stand out to the listener.

The preference responses of the auditors, in general, indicate that the audience responded more favorably to the more obviously traditional sounds, or to special effects which were unusual. It is important to note that the number of "0" responses (undecided, no opinion) was greater for the middle three Ives' songs than for the first or fifth songs. The fifth song also tended to evoke more extreme responses, (+2 and -2) than did any of the other four songs.

In the case of the Four Epitaphs, the responses to two of the pieces were significantly different than the responses to the other two pieces. In comparing the responses to Compositions # 6 (Praeludium-Hindemuth) and # 9 (Dialogue - Nocturne - Bartok), the t score was .375, not significant. A comparison of the responses between Compositions # 7 (Elegie - Debussy) and # 8 (A Fragment - Berg) produced a t score of .225, also not significant. Between the responses to Compositions # 6 and # 7, the t score was 1.374, significant at the .900 level; and between # 6 and # 8, the t score was 1.625, also significant at the .900 level. These observed differences between Composition # 6, and Compositions # 7 and # 8, were slightly greater than the differences between responses to Composition # 9, and Compositions # 7 and # 8.

TABLE 2F

Summary of Preference Responses for each Composition Second Concert

COMPOSITION	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean	Standard Deviation
1	25	46	9	5	1	1.0115	0.8800
2	9	42	22	13	1	0.5172	0.9199
3	14	33	22	16	2	0.4713	1.0300
4	7	45	26	7	2	0.5517	0.8400
5	33	22	11	16	5	0.7126	1.2900
6	23	42	13	6	3	0.8736	0.9800
7	20	32	23	10	2	0.6667	1.0200
8	16	36	24	9	2	0.6322	0.9600
9	26	33	15	12	1	0.8161	1.0400
10	15	33	28	9	2	0.5747	0.9600
11	12	43	22	7	3	0.6207	0.9300
12	17	35	25	8	2	0.6552	0.9600
13	20	31	27	8	1	0.7011	0.9600
14	18	38	25	3	3	0.7271	0.9300
15	21	28	15	12	11	0.4138	1.3500
16	31	32	15	5	4	0.9310	1.0800
17	30	23	13	10	11	0.5862	1.3800

Between the responses to Compositions # 9 and # 7, the t score was .981, significant at the .750 level; and between Compositions # 9 and # 8, the t score was 1.222, also significant at the .750 level. Indecision appeared to be the primary basis for significant difference, for the greatest difference in responses occured at the "0" degree of the preference scale. Compositions # 7 and # 8 elicited more "0" responses (undecided, no opinion) than did Compositions # 6 and # 9.

All four of the pieces were dissonant and quasi-improvisatory in style. The differences in the responses to the four pieces were not highly significant and must be viewed with caution.

There was a very definite lack of any significant differences in the responses to the five settings of the Goethe poems by Evans. The t scores generally were not significant. The following t scores were obtained in comparing the responses of the five songs by Evans: Between Compositions " 10 and # 11, .312; between Compositions # 10 and # 12, .546; between Compositions # 11 and # 12, 237; between Compositions # 11 and # 13, .550; between Compositions # 12 and # 13, .310; between # 12 and # 14, .625; and between # 13 and # 14, .312. None were significant.

The only significant difference occurred between the following pieces: Between # 10 and # 13, the t score was .856, significant at the .750 level; between # 10 and # 14, the t score was 1.175, also significant at the .750 level; and between # 11 and # 14, the t score of .870 was again significant at the .750 level. Where there was a significant difference, the level was such that it cannot be considered to be of any consequence. Hence the most striking feature of the comparisons of responses of the five songs by Evans, is the lack of any real difference in the preference responses by the auditors. It can also be readily observed that the responses tended to be grouped at the "+1" and "0" degrees of the preference scale.

The lowest mean preference response was recorded for Composition # 15 (Mennin - Sonata Concertante). As can be readily observed in Table 2F, there was a greater variance of responses along the entire scale for this work. There was a higher incidence of "-2" responses, for example. This was evident in the lower mean response and the larger standard deviation. The work was highly rhythmic, tied together in a sense by short, irregular rhythmic motives, and utilizing consonant sonorities (minor triads in particular).

A more obvious stylistic difference was evident in the two woodwind quintets. Composition # 16 (Kingman - Quintet) utilized a 12-tonw row in a relatively simple way. Although it was a serial work, the overall style was conservative and fairly traditional in its use of rhythm, meter, thematic development and use of instruments. By contrast Composition # 17 (Sydeman - Quintet) is pointillistic, dissonant, discontinuous and predominantly linear. A comparison of the responses to the two works yields a t score of 2.065, which is significant at the .975 level. The significant difference can be observed in the "-1" and "-2" degrees with a larger number of auditors responding unfavorably to Composition # 17 (Sydeman) than to Composition # 16.

In general, the more traditional sounding works, those more conservative in style, received a more favorable response than did those which were more dissonant.

Analysis of the responses to the Index of Stylistic Characteristics. The responses to the Index of Stylistic characteristics were examined in relation to the stylistic analyses of the compositions performed. (See Appendix F for the domplete stylistic analyses of the works performed at the Second Concert.)

Since the relatively short duration of the first fourteen pieces performed at the Second Concert did not allow the auditor an opportunity to give consideration to a number of characteristics, only the first choice of the auditors was extracted and studied. Hence Tables 2G-1 through 2G-14 contain only the summary of first choices of the auditors. The selection of first choices is shown in each of the tables in terms of the five music training categories.

Table 2G-1 shows the responses to Composition # 1 (Ives - Feldeinsamkeit). Seventy percent of the auditors selected a mood characteristic as a first choice. The mood characteristic selected most frequently (40 times) was "quiet, lyrical, satisfying, calm" (4). Only one other mood characteristic was chosen with any degree of frequency. That was "sentimental, tender, pleading" (3). Mood characteristic "4" was selected with regularity by auditors in all five music training categories, while characteristic "3" was selected primarily by those in the first three categories.

Only approximately twenty-two percent of the auditors selected a music characteristic as a first choice. And only one music characteristic was selected with any degree of frequency, namely, "lyric melody" (10). Auditors in Music Training Categories IV and V selected it with a greater frequency than did those in the first three categories.

The reactions of the auditors to Composition # 1 was clear and precise, both from the standpoint of mood and music characteristics. The traditional sounding and lyrical song evoked responses that related primarily to the mood of the music, rather than its structural chamacteristics.

TABLE 2G-1

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 1 Second Concert
Overall Summary

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	FIRST CHOICES BY MUSIC TRAINING CATEGORIES I	II	III	IV	V	TOTAL FIRST CHOICES
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS						
1	-	1	1	-	1	3
2	-	2	1	-	-	3
3	4	5	5	1	-	15
4	10	11	10	5	4	40
Totals	14	19	17	6	5	61
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS						
Pervading Characteristics						
10	1	1	2	3	5	12
18	-	3	1	-	-	4
26	1	-	-	-	1	2
Totals	2	4	3	3	6	18
Significant Characteristics						
No responses						
Peripheral Characteristics						
No responses						
Characteristics not related						
13	-	1	-	-	-	1
Totals	-	1	-	-	-	1

TABLE 2G-1 (continued)

	FIRST CHOICES BY MUSIC TRAINING CATEGORIES					TOTAL FIRST CHOICES
CHARACTERISTIC NO.	I	II	III	IV	V	
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES						
Mood Characteristics	14	19	17	6	5	61
% of total	(73.7)	(79.2)	(77.3)	(60.0)	(41.7)	(70.1)
Music Characteristics	2	4	3	3	6	19
% of total	(10.5)	(16.7)	(.316)	(30.0)	(50.0)	(21.8)
No. of nc responses	3	1	2	1	1	7
% of total	(15.8)	(4.1)	(9.1)	(10.0)	(8.3)	(8.1)

The responses to the stylistic characteristics of Composition # 2 (Ives - Watchman) are shown in Table 2G-2. In this case selection of mood and music characteristics were evenly divided, with forty percent of the auditors selecting mood characteristics and forty percent selecting music characteristics. Choice of particular characteristics was not as clear cut as with the first composition. Six different mood characteristics were selected with two being selected by at least ten percent of the auditors. They were "quiet, lyrical, satisfying, calm" (4) and "spiritual, serious, inspiring" (1).

Three music characteristics were selected by at least ten percent of the auditors. They were "lyric melody" (10), "dissonant sounds" (14), and "irregular melodic contour, disjointed" (9). It is significant to note that the styles analyst indicated that "dissonant sounds" (14) was a peripheral characteristic and "irregular melodic contour, disjointed" (9) was not a characteristic of the composition. Also it is of interest to note that the characteristic "dissonant sounds" (14) was selected by those in Categories II, III, IV and V. The contrasting reactions to melody, namely "lyric melody" (10) as opposed to "irregular melodic contour, disjointed" (9) occurred rather frequently and was not limited to this composition. Ives utilized a well-known hymn tune in this song, however, the melody of the hymn is somewhat distorted in this song. The potential confusion resulting from this treatment was evident since those in the first two music training categories most frequently selected the two characteristics relating to melody.

TABLE 2G-2

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 2 Second Concert
Overall Summary

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	FIRST CHOICES BY MUSIC TRAINING CATEGORIES I	II	III	IV	V	TOTAL FIRST CHOICES
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS						
1	3	2	3	-	-	8
2	1	-	3	1	1	6
3	1	3	-	-	1	5
4	2	-	5	3	1	11
7	1	1	2	-	-	4
8	-	-	1	-	-	1
Totals	8	6	14	4	3	35
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS						
Pervading Characteristics						
10	2	3	1	1	1	8
12	1	-	-	-	-	1
18	1	-	-	-	-	1
22	-	-	1	1	-	2
26	-	1	-	-	1	2
Totals	4	4	2	2	2	14
Significant Characteristics						
NONE						
Peripheral Characteristics						
14	-	4	1	2	2	9
Totals	-	4	1	2	2	9
Characteristics not related						
9	2	2	-	1	1	6
11	-	2	-	-	-	2
13	-	1	-	-	-	1
20	1	1	-	-	-	1
Totals	3	7	-	1	1	12

TABLE 2G-2 (continued)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	I	II	III	IV	V	TOTAL FIRST CHOICES
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES						
Mood Characteristics	8	6	14	4	3	35
% of total	(40.2)	(42.1)	(25.0)	(63.6)	(40.0)	(25.0)
Music Characteristics	7	15	3	5	5	35
% of total	(36.8)	(62.5)	(13.6)	(50.0)	(41.7)	(40.2)
No. of no responses	4	3	5	1	4	17
% of total	(21.1)	(12.5)	(22.7)	(10.0)	(33.3)	(19.6)

Table 2G-3 shows the reaponses to Composition # 3 (Ives - The Cage). Only twenty-two percent of the auditors selected mood characteristics. The auditors' concept of the mood of the song was rather diverse with six different mood characteristics being chosen at least once, and only one, "humorous, light, graceful" (5), being selected by about ten percent of the auditors. Rather the emphasis was upon the selection of music characteristics. The two music characteristics selected by at least ten percent of the auditors were "dissonant sounds" (14) and "irregular melodic contour, disjointed" (9). Again "irregular melodic contour, disjointed" (9) was not characteristic of the song. Rather the song utilized quartal sonorities with a conjunct melody throughout. This gives rise to the concept that possibly auditors tended to relate melody to harmony and when traditional harmonies do not support the conjunct melodic line the effect is viewed as one of disjointed melody rather than of non-traditional harmonies.

With respect to Composition # 4 (Ives - Thoreau), the emphasis once again switched to that of mood. Mood characteristics were selected by fifty-nine percent of the auditors, with three mood characteristics being selected with about the same frequency, namely, "quiet, lyrical, satisfying, calm" (4), "sentimental, tender, pleading" (3), and "heavy, gloomy, pathetic" (2). Selection of music characteristics was more diverse with nine music characteristics being selected at least once. The one selected most frequently (7 times) was "dissonant sounds" (14), a characteristic determined by the styles analyst, as not related to the song. Auditors in Music Training Categories III and V were responsible for its selection. Consonant sonorities are evident throughout the song, however, consonance was not selected as a characteristic of the piece. Consonance was implied however, in the selection of the mood characteristics.

Mood again prevailed in the selection of characteristics relating to Composition # 5 (Ives - General Booth, etc.). The predominant mood (selected 25 times) was "dramatic, agitated, exciting, triumphant" (7). (See Table 2G-5.) Mood characteristics were selected most frequently by auditors in Music Training Categories I, II and IV. Those in Categories III and V indicated a preference for music characteristics. Again "dissonant sounds" (14) was the music characteristic most frequently selected. Fifteen different music characteristics were selected at least once.

TABLE 2G-3

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 3 Second Concert
Overall Summary

	FIRST CHOICES BY MUSIC TRAINING CATEGORIES					TOTAL FIRST
CHARACTERISTIC NO.	I	II	III	IV	V	CHOICES
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS						
1	-	1	-	-	-	1
2	-	-	-	-	-	-
3	1	-	1	-	-	2
4	1	-	-	1	1	3
5	1	2	2	2	1	8
6	1	-	1	-	-	2
7	1	1	1	-	-	3
Totals	5	4	5	3	2	19
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS						
Pervading Characteristics						
12	-	1	-	-	-	1
14	4	5	2	1	2	14
16	-	2	-	2	2	6
17	1	1	-	-	1	3
20	-	1	1	-	-	2
Totals	5	10	3	3	5	26

TABLE 2G-3 (continued)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	I	II	III	IV	V	TOTAL FIRST CHOICES
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS (continued)						
Significant Characteristics						
NONE						
Peripheral Characteristics						
NONE						
Characteristics not related						
9	3	2	6	1	1	13
10	-	-	-	1	-	1
11	1	-	2	-	-	3
13	1	-	-	-	-	1
15	-	-	1	-	-	1
18	-	1	-	-	-	1
19	-	1	-	-	-	1
23	-	-	1	-	-	1
25	1	-	-	-	-	1
31	-	1	-	-	-	1
36	-	2	1	1	-	4
Totals	6	7	11	3	1	28
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES						
Mood Characteristics	5	4	5	3	2	19
% of total	(26.3)	(16.7)	(22.7)	(30.0)	(16.7)	(21.8)
Music Characteristics	11	17	14	6	6	54
% of total	(57.9)	(70.8)	(63.6)	(60.0)	(50.0)	(62.1)
No. of no responses	3	3	3	1	4	14
% of total	(15.8)	(12.5)	(13.6)	(10.0)	(33.3)	(16.1)

TABLE 2G-4

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 4 Second Concert
Overall Summary

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	FIRST CHOICES BY MUSIC TRAINING CATEGORIES I	II	III	IV	V	TOTAL FIRST CHOICES
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS						
1	1	3	-	-	1	5
2	5	3	2	-	3	13
3	4	3	6	1	-	14
4	2	8	2	3	2	17
5	-	-	1	-	-	1
7	-	-	1	-	-	1
Totals	12	17	12	4	6	51
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS						
Pervading Characteristics						
10	-	-	2	1	-	3
22	1	-	-	1	-	2
26	1	1	-	-	1	3
Totals	2	1	2	2	1	8
Significant Characteristics						
NONE						
Peripheral Characteristics						
NONE						
Characteristics not related						
9	-	-	-	1	-	1
11	-	-	1	-	-	1
13	1	1	-	-	-	2
14	-	1	4	-	2	7
17	-	1	-	-	-	1
20	1	1	-	-	-	2
Totals	2	4	5	1	2	14
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES						
Mood Characteristics	12	17	12	4	6	51
% of total	(63.2)	(70.8)	(54.5)	(40.0)	(50.0)	(58.6)
Music Characteristics	4	5	7	3	3	22
% of total	(21.1)	(20.8)	(31.8)	(30.0)	(25.0)	(25.3)
No. of no responses	3	2	3	3	3	14
% of total	(15.7)	(8.4)	(13.7)	(30.0)	(25.0)	(16.1)

TABLE 2G-5

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 5 Second Concert
Overall Summary

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	FIRST CHOICES BY MUSIC TRAINING CATEGORIES I	II	III	IV	V	TOTAL FIRST CHOICES
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS						
1	-	2	2	-	-	4
2	-	-	-	3	-	3
4	-	-	1	-	-	1
5	1	-	-	-	-	1
6	1	-	-	-	1	2
7	6	10	4	3	2	25
8	2	4	1	1	-	8
Totals	10	16	8	7	3	44
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS						
Pervading Characteristics						
12	-	-	-	-	1	1
16	-	1	1	-	-	2
25	-	-	1	-	1	2
31	1	-	1	-	1	3
33	-	-	1	-	-	1
34	1	-	-	-	-	1
36	-	-	1	-	-	1
37	-	-	1	-	-	1
Totals	2	1	6	-	3	12
Significant Characteristics						
14	3	4	-	-	3	10
Totals	3	4	-	-	3	10
Peripheral Characteristics						
13	1	-	1	-	-	2
Totals	1	-	-	-	-	2

TABLE 2G-5 (continued)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	I	II	III	IV	V	TOTAL FIRST CHOICES
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS (continued)						
Characteristics not related						
9	1	1	3	-	-	5
19	-	-	1	-	-	1
20	-	-	-	1	-	1
23	-	-	-	1	-	1
24	-	-	1	-	-	1
Totals	1	1	5	2	-	9
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES						
Mood Characteristics	10	16	8	7	3	44
% of total	(52.6)	(66.7)	(36.4)	(70.0)	(25.0)	(50.6)
Music Characteristics	7	6	12	2	6	33
% of total	(36.8)	(25.0)	(54.5)	(20.0)	(50.0)	(37.9)
No. of no responses	2	2	2	1	3	10
% of total	(10.6)	(8.3)	(9.1)	(10.0)	(25.0)	(11.5)

For each of the four piano pieces, music characteristics were most frequently selected. The music characteristic most frequently selected for Composition # 6 (Takacs - Praeludium) was "irregular melodic contour, disjointed" (9). Auditors in Music Training Categories I and II most frequently selected this characteristic. Nineteen other music characteristics were selected at least once. Seven mood characteristics were selected at least once by thirty percent of the auditors. The distribution of mood characteristic responses was rather scattered, with no mood being selected by at least ten percent of the auditors (See Table 2G-6.)

Table 2G-7 lists the responses to stylistic characteristics for Composition # 7 (Takacs - Elegie). Music characteristics were selected by fifty-three percent of the auditors, while only thirty-one percent selected mood characteristics. Again the music characteristics most frequently selected were "dissonant sounds" (14) and "irregular melodic contour, disjointed" (9). Fourteen other music characteristics were selected at least once. The mood characteristic selected most frequently was "heavy, gloomy, pathetic" (2). Five other mood characteristics were selected at least once.

Responses for Composition # 8 again placed the emphasis on music characteristics with fifty-five percent of the auditors selecting twenty music characteristics at least once. The one characteristic selected most frequently was "irregular melodic contour" (9). Auditors in Music Training Categories II and III selected it most frequently. All eight mood characteristics were selected at least once, indicating the diverse reactions towards the mood of the piano piece. No single mood characteristic was selected with enough frequency to be considered significant. It whould be noted that the auditors in Music Training Category I placed the greatest emphasis on mood characteristics, much more than those in the other categories.

The difference in emphasis between mood and music characteristics was not as great for Composition # 9. Forty-five percent of the auditors selected music characteristics as against thirty-seven percent who selected mood characteristics. Again dissonant sounds" (14) was the music characteristic most frequently selected. Eleven other music characteristics were selected at least once. Two mood characteristics were selected by at least ten percent of the auditors. They were "sentimental, tender, pleading" (3), and "heavy, gloomy, pathetic" (2). Six other mood characteristics were selected at least once.

TABLE 2C-6
Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 6 Second Concert
Overall Summary

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	FIRST CHOICES BY MUSIC TRAINING CATEGORIES I	II	III	IV	V	TOTAL FIRST CHOICES
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS						
1	-	2	1	-	-	3
2	-	1	-	1	1	3
3	1	2	-	-	1	4
4	1	-	5	1	-	7
5	1	-	1	-	-	2
7	2	1	2	1	-	6
8	-	-	1	-	-	1
Totals	5	6	10	3	2	26

TABLE 2G-6 (continued)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	I	II	III	IV	V	TOTAL FIRST CHOICES
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS						
Pervading Characteristics						
11	-	1	2	-	-	3
16	-	1	-	-	-	1
17	1	1	-	-	-	1
26	-	-	-	-	1	1
Totals	1	2	2	-	1	6
Significant Characteristics						
9	6	5	-	3	2	16
12	2	-	1	-	-	3
14	1	-	1	2	-	4
20	-	2	-	-	-	2
21	-	1	-	-	-	1
24	-	-	1	-	-	1
31	-	1	1	-	-	2
36	1	-	1	1	-	3
Totals	10	9	5	6	2	32
Peripheral Characteristics						
13	-	-	1	-	-	1
19	-	-	1	-	-	1
37	-	1	-	-	-	1
Totals	-	1	2	-	-	3
Characteristics not related						
10	-	-	-	-	1	1
15	1	-	-	-	-	1
18	-	-	1	-	1	2
27	-	1	-	-	-	1
35	-	1	-	-	-	1
Totals	1	2	1	-	2	6
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES						
Mood Characteristics	5	6	10	3	2	26
% of total	(26.3)	(25.0)	(45.5)	(30.0)	(16.6)	(29.9)
Music Characteristics	12	14	10	6	5	47
% of total	(63.2)	(58.3)	(45.5)	(60.0)	(4.17)	(54.0)
No. of no responses	2	4	2	1	5	14
% of total	(10.5)	(16.7)	(9.0)	(10.0)	(41.7)	(16.1)

TABLE 2G-7

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 7 Second Concert
Overall Summary

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	FIRST CHOICES BY MUSIC TRAINING CATEGORIES					TOTAL FIRST CHOICES
	I	II	III	IV	V	
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS						
1	1	1	1	-	-	3
2	5	3	2	1	1	12
3	1	1	2	-	1	4
4	1	1	1	3	-	6
5	-	-	-	1	-	1
7	1	-	-	-	-	1
Totals	9	5	6	5	1	27
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS						
Pervading Characteristics						
16	1	-	-	-	2	1
18	-	-	1	-	1	2
26	-	1	-	-	1	2
35	-	-	-	1	-	1
Totals	1	1	1	1	4	8
Significant Characteristics						
9	3	3	3	-	-	9
10	-	-	1	1	-	2
14	1	3	5	-	1	10
20	-	1	1	-	-	2
Totals	4	7	10	1	1	23
Peripheral Characteristics						
12	-	-	-	-	1	1
23	1	-	-	-	-	1
Totals	1	-	-	-	1	2

TABLE 2G-7 (continued)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	I	II	III	IV	V	TOTAL FIRST CHOICES
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS (continued)						
Characteristics not related						
11	-	2	1	-	-	3
17	1	-	1	-	-	2
19	-	-	-	-	1	1
27	-	3	1	-	-	4
31	-	1	-	1	-	2
32	1	-	-	-	-	1
Totals	2	6	3	1	1	13
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES						
Mood Characteristics	9	6	6	5	1	27
% of total	(47.4)	(25.0)	(27.3)	(50.0)	(8.3)	(31.0)
Music Characteristics	8	14	14	3	7	46
% of total	(42.1)	(58.3)	(63.6)	(30.0)	(58.4)	(52.9)
No. of no responses	2	4	2	2	4	14
% of total	(10.5)	(16.7)	(9.1)	(20.0)	(33.3)	(16.1)

TABLE 2G-8

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 8 Second Concert
Overall Summary

	FIRST CHOICES BY MUSIC TRAINING CATEGORIES					
CHARACTERISTIC NO.	I	II	III	IV	V	TOTAL FIRST CHOICES
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS						
1	-	1	-	-	-	1
2	2	-	1	1	-	4
3	1	1	-	-	-	2
4	2	-	2	-	-	4
5	-	1	-	-	-	1
6	4	1	-	-	-	5
7	3	1	-	-	-	4
8	-	-	1	1	-	2
Totals	12	5	4	2	-	23

TABLE 2G-8 (continued)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	I	II	III	IV	V	TOTAL FIRST CHOICES
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS						
Pervading Characteristics						
9	1	6	7	2	2	18
11	-	2	2	-	-	4
14	1	1	-	-	1	3
17	-	-	1	-	-	1
20	-	-	-	2	1	3
21	-	2	1	-	-	3
36	-	-	1	-	-	1
Totals	2	11	12	4	4	33
Significant Characteristics						
16	-	-	-	-	1	1
19	-	1	-	-	-	1
23	1	-	-	-	1	2
25	-	-	1	1	-	2
31	-	-	1	-	-	1
35	-	-	1	-	-	1
37	1	-	-	-	-	1
Totals	2	1	3	1	2	9
Peripheral Characteristics						
NONE						
Characteristics not related						
10	-	-	-	1	-	1
13	1	-	-	-	-	1
22	-	1	-	-	-	1
29	-	1	-	-	-	1
32	-	1	-	-	-	1
33	-	1	-	-	-	1
Totals	1	4	-	1	-	6
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES						
Mood Characteristics	12	5	4	2	-	23
% of total	(63.2)	(20.8)	(18.2)	(20.0)	(00.0)	(26.4)
Music Characteristics	5	16	15	6	6	48
% of total	(26.3)	(66.7)	(68.2)	(60.0)	(50.0)	(55.2)
No. of no responses	2	3	3	2	6	16
% of total	(10.5)	(12.5)	(13.6)	(20.0)	(50.0)	(18.4)

TABLE 2G-9

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 9 Second Concert
Overall Summary

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	FIRST CHOICES BY MUSIC TRAINING CATEGORIES I	II	III	IV	V	TOTAL FIRST CHOICES
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS						
1	2	1	-	-	-	3
2	3	3	-	1	2	9
3	2	4	4	1	-	11
4	1	-	1	-	-	2
5	-	1	1	-	-	2
6	-	1	-	-	-	1
7	1	-	2	-	-	3
8	-	1	-	-	-	1
Totals	9	11	8	2	2	32
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS						
Pervading Characteristics						
9	-	1	1	1	-	3
14	4	4	4	-	2	14
21	-	-	1	-	-	1
11	-	1	1	-	-	2
Totals	4	6	7	1	2	20
Significant Characteristics						
16	-	1	2	-	1	4
17	1	-	1	-	1	3
20	-	-	1	-	-	1
26	-	-	1	-	-	1
Totals	1	1	5	-	2	9
Peripheral Characteristics						
31	-	1	-	1	-	2
Totals	-	1	-	1	-	2

TABLE 2G-9 (continued)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	I	II	III	IV	V	TOTAL FIRST CHOICES
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS (continued)						
Characteristics not related						
13	1	1	-	2	-	4
18	1	-	-	-	1	2
19	-	1	-	1	-	2
Totals	2	2	-	3	1	8
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES						
Mood Characteristics	9	11	8	2	2	32
% of total	(47.4)	(45.8)	(36.4)	(20.0)	(16.6)	(36.8)
Music Characteristics	7	10	12	5	5	39
% of total	(36.8)	(41.7)	(54.5)	(50.0)	(41.7)	(44.8)
No. of no responses	3	3	2	3	5	16
% of total	(15.8)	(12.5)	(9.1)	(30.0)	(41.7)	(18.4)

In responding to the five songs by Evans, the auditors once again began to place a greater emphasis on the mood characteristics of the music. Composition # 10 (Evans - Blick um Blick) elicited mood responses from forty-three percent of the auditors while thirty-seven percent selected music characteristics. There was little general agreement as to which characteristics were most important. No one characteristic was selected by at least ten percent of the auditors. Eight mood characteristics were selected at least once, while thirteen music characteristics were selected at least once. (See Table 2G-10.)

Table 2G-11 lists the selections of stylistic characteristics for Composition # 11 (Evans - Dem aufgehenden Vollmonde). Forty-six percent of the auditors selected eight mood characteristics at least once. One mood characteristic was selected more frequently than the others, namely, "dramatic, agitated, exciting, triumphant" (7). Thirty-two percent of the auditors selected music characteristics. Thirteen music characteristics were selected with "dissonant sounds" (14) being selected most frequently.

Selection of mood and music characteristics was equally divided for Composition # 12 (Evans - Finnisches Lied). Thirty-nine percent of the auditors selected eight mood characteristics. The mood characteristic most frequently selected was "bright, cheerful, gay" (6). Also mentioned with enough frequency to be significant was "humorous, light, graceful" (5) and to a lesser degree "dramatic, agitated, exciting, triumphant" (7). Only twenty-nine percent of the auditors selected music characteristics, dividing their selections among ten characteristics. Although only mentioned seven times, the one most frequently selected was "tempo or speed of the music" (37). The tempo of this song was fast and lively. (See Table 2G-13.)

Selection of mood characteristics again were predominant as fifty-five percent of the auditors selected five mood characteristics for Composition # 14 (Evans - Gleich und Gleich). Again, most frequently mentioned was "bright, cheerful, gay" (6), followed closely by "humorous, light, graceful" (5). To a lesser degree "dramatic, agitated, exciting, triumphant" (7) was also significant as a mood characteristic. Only twenty-one percent of the auditors selected ten music characteristics. No one music characteristic was selected with enough frequency to be considered significant. (See Table 2G-14.)

TABLE 2G-10

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 10 Second Concert
Overall Summary

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	FIRST CHOICES MUSIC TRAINING CATEGORIES I	II	III	IV	V	TOTAL FIRST CHOICES
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS						
1	3	-	-	-	1	4
2	1	-	-	-	-	1
3	3	4	-	-	-	7
4	1	2	1	-	-	5
5	1	-	2	1	1	4
6	2	3	3	-	-	8
7	1	1	2	-	1	5
8	1	-	2	-	-	3
Totals	13	10	10	1	3	37

TABLE 2G-10 (continued)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	I	II	III	IV	V	TOTAL FIRST CHOICES
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS						
Pervading Characteristics						
15	-	-	-	1	-	1
30	-	2	-	1	-	3
34	1	-	1	1	2	5
Totals	1	2	1	3	2	9
Significant Characteristics						
10	1	2	2	3	-	8
18	-	2	1	-	1	4
25	-	2	-	-	1	3
Totals	1	6	3	3	2	15
Peripheral Characteristics						
37	-	-	1	-	-	1
Totals	-	-	1	-	-	1
Characteristics not related						
9	-	1	-	-	-	1
11	-	-	1	-	-	1
14	1	-	-	-	-	1
17	-	-	1	-	-	1
24	-	-	2	-	-	2
32	-	1	-	-	-	1
Totals	1	2	4	-	-	7
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES						
Mood Characteristics	13	10	10	1	3	37
% of total	(68.4)	(41.7)	(45.5)	(10.0)	(25.0)	(42.5)
Music Characteristics	3	10	9	6	4	32
% of total	(15.8)	(41.7)	(40.9)	(60.0)	(33.3)	(36.8)
No. of no responses	3	4	3	3	5	18
% of total	(15.8)	(16.6)	(13.6)	(30.0)	(41.7)	(20.7)

TABLE 2G-11

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 11 Second Concert
Overall Summary

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	FIRST CHOICES MUSIC TRAINING CATEGORIES I	II	III	IV	V	TOTAL FIRST CHOICES
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS						
1	-	2	-	-	-	2
2	2	2	-	-	-	4
3	2	2	4	-	-	8
4	2	2	1	1	-	6
5	-	1	-	-	-	1
6	-	-	1	-	-	1
7	3	5	6	1	1	16
8	2	-	-	-	-	2
Totals	11	14	12	2	1	40
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS						
Pervading Characteristics						
30	1	-	-	-	-	1
34	1	-	1	-	-	2
Totals	2	-	1	-	-	3
Significant Characteristics						
9	1	-	-	-	2	3
25	-	-	1	-	-	1
37	-	-	1	-	-	1
Totals	1	-	2	-	2	5
Peripheral Characteristics						
10	-	1	-	2	1	4
14	2	1	1	3	1	8
16	-	1	-	-	1	2
22	-	-	2	-	-	2
Totals	2	3	3	5	3	16
Characteristics not related						
19	-	1	-	-	-	1
20	-	-	-	-	1	1
23	-	1	-	-	-	1
27	-	-	1	-	-	1
Totals	-	2	1	-	1	4

TABLE 2G-11 (continued)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	I	II	III	IV	V	TOTAL FIRST CHOICES
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES						
Mood Characteristics	11	14	12	2	1	40
% of total	(57.9)	(58.4)	(54.5)	(20.0)	(8.3)	(46.0)
Music Characteristics	5	5	7	5	6	23
% of total	(26.3)	(26.3)	(31.8)	(50.0)	(50.0)	(32.2)
No. of no responses	3	5	3	3	5	19
% of total	(15.8)	(26.3)	(13.6)	(30.0)	(41.7)	(21.8)

TABLE 2G-12

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 12 Second Concert
Overall Summary

	FIRST CHOICES BY MUSIC TRAINING CATEGORIES					
CHARACTERISTIC NO.	I	II	III	IV	V	TOTAL FIRST CHOICES
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS						
1	-	1	-	-	-	1
2	1	-	-	-	-	1
3	2	-	1	1	-	4
4	2	-	1	-	-	3
5	1	1	2	-	-	4
6	1	6	2	2	1	12
7	2	-	3	-	1	6
8	-	-	3	-	-	3
Totals	9	8	12	3	2	34
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS						
Pervading Characteristics						
10	1	6	2	2	1	12
15	1	-	-	-	-	1
30	-	1	1	-	-	2
34	-	-	-	2	1	3
Totals	2	7	3	4	2	18

TABLE 2G-12 (continued)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	FIRST CHOICES BY MUSIC TRAINING CATEGORIES I	II	III	IV	V	TOTAL FIRST CHOICES
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS (continued)						
Significant Characteristics						
18	-	-	-	1	1	2
22	-	-	1	-	-	1
26	-	-	-	-	-	1
31	-	-	1	-	-	1
Totals	1	-	2	1	1	5
Peripheral Characteristics						
25	-	-	1	-	1	2
37	-	1	1	-	-	2
Totals	-	1	2	-	1	4
Characteristics not related						
9	1	-	-	-	-	1
14	1	-	-	-	1	2
17	-	2	-	-	-	2
23	-	2	-	-	-	2
24	1	-	-	-	-	1
Totals	3	4	-	-	1	7
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES						
Mood Characteristics	9	8	12	3	2	34
% of total	(47.4)	(33.3)	(54.6)	(30.0)	(16.6)	(39.1)
Music Characteristics	6	12	7	5	5	35
% of total	(31.6)	(50.0)	(31.8)	(50.0)	(41.7)	(40.2)
No. of no responses	4	4	3	2	5	18
% of total	(21.1)	(16.7)	(13.6)	(20.0)	(41.7)	(20.7)

TABLE 2G-13

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 13 Second Concert
Overall Summary

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	FIRST CHOICES BY MUSIC TRAINING CATEGORIES I	II	III	IV	V	TOTAL FIRST CHOICES
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS						
1	-	-	1	-	-	1
4	1	-	-	-	-	1
5	1	5	4	1	-	11
6	6	8	6	1	1	22
7	2	2	1	1	1	7
8	-	-	1	-	-	1
Totals	10	15	13	3	2	43
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS						
Pervading Characteristics						
34	1	-	-	1	-	2
36	-	1	2	-	1	4
Totals	1	1	2	1	1	6
Significant Characteristics						
9	-	1	1	-	1	3
25	-	-	1	2	1	4
31	-	1	-	-	-	1
37	2	2	1	1	1	7
Totals	2	4	3	3	3	15
Peripheral Characteristics						
14	-	-	1	-	-	1
Totals	-	-	1	-	-	1
Characteristics not related						
24	-	-	-	-	1	1
33	-	1	-	-	-	1
35	-	-	-	1	-	1
Totals	-	1	-	1	1	3

TABLE 2G-13 (continued)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	I	II	III	IV	V	TOTAL FIRST CHOICES
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES						
Mood Characteristics	10	15	13	3	2	43
% of total	(52.6)	(62.5)	(59.1)	(30.0)	(16.6)	(49.4)
Music Characteristics	3	6	6	5	5	25
% of total	(15.8)	(25.0)	(27.3)	(50.0)	(41.7)	(28.7)
No. of no responses	6	3	3	2	5	19
% of total	(31.6)	(12.5)	(13.6)	(20.0)	(41.7)	(21.9)

TABLE 2G-14

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 14 Second Concert
Overall Summary

	FIRST CHOICES BY MUSIC TRAINING CATEGORIES					
CHARACTERISTIC NO.	I	II	III	IV	V	TOTAL FIRST CHOICES
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS						
3	1	1	-	-	-	2
4	2	1	2	-	-	4
5	4	5	5	1	-	15
6	3	8	3	3	1	18
7	1	1	4	1	2	9
Totals	11	15	14	5	3	48
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS						
Pervading Characteristics						
25	-	1	1	-	1	3
30	-	1	-	-	-	1
Totals	-	2	1	-	1	4

TABLE 2G-14 (continued)

	FIRST CHOICES BY MUSIC TRAINING CATEGORIES					TOTAL FIRST CHOICES
CHARACTERISTIC NO.	I	II	III	IV	V	
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS (continued)						
Significant Characteristics						
10	-	-	1	1	1	3
15	-	-	-	-	1	1
Totals	-	-	1	1	2	4
Peripheral Characteristics						
14	-	-	1	-	-	1
37	-	-	1	1	-	2
Totals	-	-	2	1	-	3
Characteristics not related						
9	-	2	-	1	-	3
21	1	1	-	-	-	2
24	1	-	-	-	-	1
31	-	1	-	-	-	1
Totals	2	4	-	1	-	7
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES						
Mood Characteristics	11	15	14	5	3	48
% of total	(57.9)	(62.5)	(63.6)	(50.0)	(25.0)	(55.2)
Music Characteristics	2	6	4	3	3	18
% of total	(10.5)	(25.0)	(18.2)	(30.0)	(25.0)	(20.7)
No. of no responses	6	3	4	2	6	21
% of total	(31.6)	(12.5)	(18.2)	(20.0)	(50.0)	(24.1)

The last three compositions presented at the Second Concert were extended works. Therefore the auditors had a greater opportunity to select additional characteristics as being significant in terms of each composition. Also the changing character of the more extended works led to a greater diversity of possible legitimate responses. An examination of the responses showed that over fifty percent of the auditors selected as least two characteristics as being important. Tables 2G-15 through 2G-32 set forth the first and second choices made by the auditors for the final three works. In determining the sum indicated in each table, a first choice was given a weighting of two and a second choices a weighting of one. Therefore the sum is a better indication of the emphasis placed on a particular characteristic.

Tables 2G-15 through 2G-20 list the responses to the stylistic characteristics for Composition # 15 (Mennin - Sonata Concertante). For this composition the emphasis was placed on the music characteristics. Selected most frequently were two significant characteristics, "dissonant sounds" (14) and "cluttered texture, busy music" (25). "Irregular melodic contour, disjointed" (9) was also mentioned by over ten percent of the auditors. A total of twenty-two music characteristics were selected at least once by the auditors. Of the six mood characteristics selected at least once, only one stood out as significant, namely, "dramatic, agitated, exciting, triumphant"(7).

Tables 2G-21 through 2G-26 list the responses to the characteristics for Composition # 16 (Kingman - Quintet). This more traditionally sounding work also had a slightly greater emphasis placed on mood characteristics by the auditors. Eight mood characteristics were selected at least once, with two being selected by at least ten percent of the auditors. They were "bright, cheerful, gay" (6) and "humorous, light, graceful" (5). Nineteen music characteristics were selected at least once by the auditors. Most frequently selected were "wind instrument color" (28), "dissonant sounds" (14), and "interweaving of melodies, contrapuntal" (21). Also mentioned by at least ten percent of the auditors was "irregular melodic contour, disjointed" (9).

Tables 2G-27 through 2G-32 list the responses to the characteristics for Composition # 17 (Sydeman - Quintet). In marked contrast to the responses to Composition # 16, less than ten percent of the auditors selected a mood characteristic. Hence mood responses were of no significance. A total of twenty-one characteristics were selected at least once by the auditors. The four selected by at least ten percent of the auditors were "dissonant sounds" (14), "disjointed series of sounds, pointillistic" (19), "irregular melodic contour, disjointed" (9), and "irregular rhythms" (36).

TABLE 2G-15

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 15 Second Concert
Overall Summary

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	CHOICES First	Second	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS				
1	1	2	3	4
2	-	1	1	1
3	1	3	4	5
6	2	2	4	6
7	14	1	15	29
8	-	6	6	6
Totals	18	15	33	51
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS				
Pervading Characteristics				
21	3	3	6	9
29	3	2	5	8
33	1	-	1	2
34	1	2	3	4
Totals	8	7	15	23

TABLE 2G-15 (continued)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS (continued)				
Significant Characteristics				
9	8	3	11	19
10	3	-	3	6
14	8	4	12	20
15	1	1	2	3
16	1	-	1	2
18	2	3	5	7
20	1	1	2	3
25	8	4	12	20
31	2	1	3	5
36	2	2	4	6
37	1	4	5	6
23	-	2	.	.
Totals	37	25	60	97
Peripheral Characteristics				
11	1	2	3	4
13	1	2	3	4
Totals	2	4	6	8
Characteristics not related				
17	2	1	3	5
19	-	6	6	6
24	1	2	3	4
35	1	1	2	3
Totals	4	10	14	18
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES				
Mood Characteristics	18	15	33	51
% of total	(20.7)	(17.2)	(19.0)	(19.5)
Music Characteristics	51	46	95	148
% of total	(58.6)	(52.9)	(54.6)	(56.7)
No. of no responses	18	26	44	62
% of total	(20.7)	(29.9)	(25.3)	(23.8)

TABLE 2G-16

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 15 Seconc Concert
Auditors in Music Training Category I

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	CHOICES First	Second	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS				
1	-	-	-	-
2	-	-	-	-
3	-	-	-	-
4	-	-	-	-
5	-	-	-	-
6	2	1	3	5
7	2	-	2	4
8	-	1	1	1
Totals	4	2	6	10
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS				
Pervading Characteristics				
21	1	-	1	2
29	1	1	2	3
Totals	2	1	3	5
Significant Characteristics				
9	3	-	3	6
14	1	2	3	4
15	-	1	1	1
18	-	1	1	1
25	2	2	4	6
37	1	1	2	3
Peripheral Characteristics				
NONE				
Characteristics not related				
17	1	1	2	3
19	-	1	1	1
24	1	-	1	2
35	-	1	1	1
Totals	2	3	5	7

TABLE 2G-16 (continued)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Total	Sum
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES				
Mood Characteristics	4	2	6	10
% of total	(21.1)	(10.5)	(15.8)	(17.5)
Music Characteristics	11	11	22	33
% of total	(57.8)	(57.8)	(57.9)	(57.9)
No. of no responses	4	6	10	14
% of total	(21.1)	(31.7)	(26.3)	(24.6)

TABLE 2G-17

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 15 Second Concert
Auditors in Music Training Category II

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	CHOICES First	Second	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS				
1	-	1	1	1
3	-	1	1	1
7	8	-	8	16
8	-	1	1	1
Totals	8	3	11	19
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS				
Pervading Characteristics				
21	-	1	1	1
25	-	1	1	1
34	-	2	2	2
Totals	-	4	4	4

TABLE 2G-17 (continued)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS (continued)				
Significant Characteristics				
9	1	1	2	3
10	1	-	1	2
14	3	-	3	6
16	1	-	1	2
18	1	2	3	4
23	-	1	1	1
25	3	2	5	8
37	-	1	1	1
Totals	10	7	17	27
Peripheral Characteristics				
11	1	1	2	3
Totals	1	1	2	3
Characteristics not related				
19	-	1	1	1
24	-	1	1	1
35	1	-	1	2
Totals	1	2	3	4
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES				
Mood Characteristics	8	3	11	19
% of total	(33.3)	(12.5)	(22.9)	(26.4)
Music Characteristics	12	14	26	38
% of total	(50.0)	(58.3)	(54.2)	(52.8)
No. of no responses	4	7	11	15
% of total	(16.7)	(29.2)	(22.9)	(20.8)

TABLE 2G-18

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 15 Second Concert
Auditors in Music Training Category III

	CHOICES			
CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS				
2	-	1	1	1
3	1	2	3	4
7	3	1	4	7
8	-	4	4	4
Totals	4	8	12	16
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS				
Pervading Characteristics				
21	1	1	2	3
29	1	-	1	2
34	1	-	1	2
Totals	3	1	4	7
Significant Characteristics				
9	1	1	2	3
10	1	-	1	2
14	2	1	3	5
15	1	-	1	2
18	1	-	1	2
20	1	-	1	2
23	-	1	1	1
25	2	-	2	4
31	1	-	1	2
36	1	1	2	3
37	-	1	1	1
Totals	11	5	16	27
Peripheral Characteristics				
11	-	1	1	1
13	-	1	1	1
Totals	-	2	2	2

TABLE 2G-18 (continued)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS (continued)				
Characteristics not related				
17	1	-	1	2
19	-	2	2	2
Totals	1	2	3	4
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES				
Mood Characteristics	4	8	12	16
% of total	(18.2)	(36.4)	(27.3)	(24.2)
Music Characteristics	15	10	25	40
% of total	(68.2)	(45.5)	(56.8)	(60.6)
No. of no responses	3	4	7	10
% of total	(13.6)	(18.1)	(15.9)	(15.2)

TABLE 2G-19

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 15 Second Concert
Auditors in Music Training Category IV

	CHOICES			
CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS				
1	-	1	1	1
6	-	1	1	1
Totals	-	2	2	2
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS				
Pervading Characteristics				
21	1	1	2	3
29	1	-	1	2
Totals	2	1	3	5

TABLE 2G-19 (continued)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS (continued)				
Significant Characteristics				
9	2	-	2	4
14	1	1	2	3
31	1	1	2	3
36	1	-	1	2
Totals	5	2	7	12
Peripheral Characteristics				
13	-	1	1	1
Totals	-	1	1	1
Characteristics not related				
NONE				
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES				
Mood Characteristics	-	2	2	2
% of total	(00.0)	(20.0)	(10.0)	(6.7)
Music Characteristics	7	4	11	18
% of total	(70.0)	(40.0)	(55.0)	(60.0)
No. of no responses	3	4	7	10
% of total	(30.0)	(40.0)	(35.0)	(33.3)

TABLE 2G-20

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 15 Second Concert
Auditors in Music Training Category V

	CHOICES			
CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS				
1	1	-	1	2
7	1	-	1	2
Totals	2	-	2	4

TABLE 2G-20 (continued)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS				
Pervading Characteristics				
33	1	-	1	2
Totals	1	-	1	2
Significant Characteristics				
9	1	1	2	3
10	1	-	1	2
14	1	-	1	2
20	-	1	1	1
25	1	-	1	2
36	-	1	1	1
37	-	1	1	1
Totals	4	4	8	12
Peripheral Characteristics				
13	1	-	1	2
Totals	1	-	1	2
Characteristics not related				
19	-	2	2	2
24	-	1	1	1
Totals	-	3	3	3
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES				
Mood Characteristics	2	-	2	4
% of total	(16.7)	(00.0)	(8.3)	(11.1)
Music Characteristics	6	7	13	19
% of total	(50.0)	(58.3)	(54.2)	(52.8)
No. of no responses	4	5	9	13
% of total	(33.3)	(41.7)	(37.5)	(36.1)

TABLE 2G-21

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 16 Second Concert
Overall Summary

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	CHOICES First	Second	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS				
1	-	1	1	1
2	1	-	1	2
3	1	3	4	5
4	3	2	5	8
5	7	3	10	17
6	10	3	13	23
7	2	-	2	4
8	1	-	1	2
Totals	25	12	37	62
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS				
Pervading Characteristics				
20	2	4	6	8
21	5	6	11	16
28	9	5	14	23
Totals	16	15	31	47
Significant Characteristics				
9	7	2	9	16
11	-	2	2	2
14	7	5	12	19
17	2	1	3	5
18	2	2	4	6
25	1	3	4	5
31	1	1	2	3
34	-	1	1	1
36	1	3	4	5
37	-	1	1	1
Totals	21	21	42	63

TABLE 2G-21 (continued)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	CHOICES		Total	Sum
	First	Second		
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS (continued)				
Peripheral Characteristics				
10	1	3	4	5
13	1	1	2	3
15	1	2	3	4
23	1	-	1	2
24	1	1	2	3
Totals	5	7	12	17
Characteristics not related				
27	-	1	1	1
Totals	-	1	1	1
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES				
Mood Characteristics	25	12	37	62
% of total	(28.7)	(18.3)	(21.3)	(23.8)
Music Characteristics	42	44	86	128
% of total	(48.3)	(50.6)	(49.4)	(49.0)
No. of no responses	20	31	51	71
% of total	(23.0)	(35.6)	(29.3)	(27.2)
	87	87	174	261

TABLE 2G-22

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 16 Second Concert
Auditors in Music Training Category I

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	CHOICES		Total	Sum
	First	Second		
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS				
2	1	-	1	2
4	2	-	2	4
5	3	1	4	7
6	2	2	4	6
7	1	-	1	2
Totals	9	3	12	21

TABLE 2G-22 (continued)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS				
Pervading Characteristics				
20	-	1	1	1
21	-	2	2	2
28	3	1	4	7
Totals	3	4	7	10
Significant Characteristics				
18	2	1	3	5
25	1	-	1	2
Totals	3	1	4	7
Peripheral Characteristics				
10	-	2	2	2
13	-	1	1	1
15	1	-	1	2
Totals	1	3	4	5
Characteristics not related				
NONE				
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES				
Mood Characteristics	9	3	12	21
% of total	(47.4)	(15.8)	(31.6)	(36.2)
Music Characteristics	7	8	15	22
% of total	(36.8)	(42.1)	(39.5)	(37.9)
No. of no responses	3	8	11	15
% of total	(15.8)	(42.1)	(28.9)	(25.9)

TABLE 2G-23

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 16 Second Concert
Auditors in Music Training Category II

	CHOICES			
CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS				
1	-	1	1	1
3	-	2	2	2
6	7	-	7	14
7	1	-	1	2
Totals	8	3	11	19
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS				
Pervading Characteristics				
20	1	2	3	4
21	2	1	3	5
28	2	2	4	6
Totals	5	5	10	15
Significant Characteristics				
9	2	2	4	6
11	-	1	1	1
14	4	2	6	10
25	-	1	1	1
31	-	1	1	1
Totals	6	7	13	19
Peripheral Characteristics				
15	-	1	1	1
23	1	-	1	2
33	1	1	2	3
Totals	2	2	4	6
Characteristics not related				
27	-	1	1	1
Totals	-	1	1	1

TABLE 2G-23 (continued)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Total	Sum
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES				
Mood Characteristics	8	3	11	19
% of total	(33.3)	(12.5)	(22.9)	(26.4)
Music Characteristics	13	15	28	41
% of total	(54.2)	(62.5)	(58.3)	(56.9)
No. of no responses	3	6	9	12
% of total	(12.5)	(25.0)	(18.8)	(16.7)

TABLE 2G-24

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 16 Second Concert
Auditors in Music Training Category III

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	CHOICES First	Second	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS				
3	1	-	1	2
4	1	2	3	5
5	2	2	4	6
6	-	1	1	1
9	1	-	1	2
Totals	5	5	10	16
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS				
Pervading Characteristics				
20	1	-	1	2
21	-	1	1	1
28	2	1	3	5
Totals	3	2	5	8

TABLE 2G-24 (continued)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS (continued)				
Significant Characteristics				
9	2	-	2	4
11	-	1	1	1
14	2	-	2	4
17	2	-	2	4
25	-	1	1	1
34	-	1	1	1
36	1	2	3	4
Totals	7	5	12	19
Peripheral Characteristics				
10	1	1	2	3
Totals	1	1	2	3
Characteristics not related				
NONE				
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES				
Mood Characteristics	5	5	10	15
% of total	(22.7)	(22.7)	(22.7)	(22.7)
Music Characteristics	11	8	19	30
% of total	(50.0)	(36.4)	(43.2)	(45.5)
No. of no responses	6	9	15	21
% of total	(27.3)	(40.9)	(34.1)	(31.8)

TABLE 2G-25

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 16 Second Concert
Auditors in Music Training Category IV

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	CHOICES First	 Second	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS				
3	-	1	1	1
5	1	-	1	2
Totals	1	1	2	3

TABLE 2G-25 (continued)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS				
Pervading Charadteristics				
21	-	1	1	1
28	2	-	2	4
Totals	2	1	3	5
Significant Characteristics				
9	1	-	1	2
14	1	1	2	3
18	-	1	1	1
31	1	-	1	2
36	-	1	1	1
37	-	1	1	1
Totals	3	4	7	10
Peripheral Characteristics				
13	1	-	1	2
15	-	1	1	1
Totals	1	1	2	3
Characteristics not related				
NONE				
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES				
Mood Characteristics	1	1	2	3
% of total	(10.0)	(10.0)	(10.0)	(10.0)
Music Characteristics	6	6	12	18
% of total	(60.0)	(60.0)	(60.0)	(60.0)
No. of no responses	3	3	6	9
% of total	(30.0)	(30.0)	(30.0)	(30.0)

TABLE 2G - 26

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 16 Second Concert
Auditors in Music Training Category V

	CHOICES			
CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS				
5	1	-	1	2
6	1	-	1	2
Totals	2	-	2	4
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS				
Pervading Characteristics				
20	-	1	1	1
21	3	1	4	7
28	-	1	1	1
Totals	3	3	6	9
Significant Characteristics				
9	2	-	2	4
14	-	2	2	2
17	-	1	1	1
25	-	1	1	1
Totals	2	4	6	8
Peripheral Characteristics				
NONE				
Characteristics not related				
NONE				
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES				
Mood Characteristics	2	-	2	4
% of total	(16.6)	(00.0)	(8.3)	(11.1)
Music Characteristics	5	7	12	17
% of total	(41.7)	(58.3)	(50.0)	(47.2)
No. of no responses	5	5	10	15
% of total	(41.7)	(41.7)	(41.7)	(41.7)

TABLE 2G-27

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 17 Second Concert
Overall Summary

	CHOICES			
CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS				
2	2	1	3	5
3	-	1	1	1
5	2	2	4	6
6	4	2	4	10
7	-	1	1	1
8	1	-	1	2
Totals	9	7	16	25
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS				
Pervading Characteristics				
9	12	3	15	27
11	2	2	4	6
14	8	12	20	28
17	3	2	5	8
19	10	9	19	29
20	1	1	2	3
21	1	1	2	3
25	5	3	8	13
28	3	5	8	11
36	5	4	9	14
Totals	50	42	92	142
Significant Characteristics				
16	1	1	2	3
31	-	2	2	2
33	2	-	2	4
37	-	1	1	1
Totals	3	4	7	10
Peripheral Characteristics				
24	1	-	1	2
34	1	-	1	2
Totals	2	-	2	4

TABLE 2G-27 (continued)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS (continued)				
Characteristics not related				
13	-	1	1	1
18	-	2	2	2
22	1	-	1	2
26	1	-	1	2
27	1	3	4	5
Totals	3	6	9	12
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES				
Mood Characteristics	9	7	16	25
% of total	(10.3)	(8.0)	(9.2)	(9.6)
Music Characteristics	58	52	110	168
% of total	(66.7)	(59.8)	(63.2)	(64.4)
No. of no responses	20	28	48	68
% of total	(23.0)	(32.2)	(27.6)	(26.0)

TABLE 2G-28

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 17 Second Concert
Auditors in Music Training Category I

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	CHOICES First	 Second	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS				
3	-	1	1	1
5	1	-	1	2
6	1	-	1	2
Totals	2	1	3	5

TABLE 2G-28 (continued)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS				
Pervading Characteristics				
9	3	-	3	6
14	3	3	6	9
17	1	1	2	3
19	1	2	3	4
20	-	1	1	1
25	2	-	2	4
28	1	2	3	4
36	1	-	1	2
Totals	12	9	21	33
Significant Characteristics				
37	-	1	1	1
Totals	-	1	1	1
Peripheral Characteristics				
NONE				
Characteristics not related				
26	1	-	1	2
27	-	1	1	1
Totals	1	1	2	3
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES				
Mood Characteristics	2	1	3	5
% of total	(10.5)	(5.3)	(7.9)	(8.8)
Music Characteristics	13	11	24	37
% of total	(68.4)	(57.9)	(63.2)	(64.9)
No. of no responses	4	7	11	15
% of total	(21.1)	(36.8)	(28.9)	(26.3)

TABLE 2G-29

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 17 Second Concert
Auditors in Music Training Category II

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	CHOICES First	Second	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS				
2	1	-	1	2
5	-	1	1	1
6	2	1	3	5
7	-	1	1	1
Totals	3	3	6	9
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS				
Pervading Characteristics				
9	4	1	5	9
11	1	1	2	3
14	2	4	6	8
17	1	-	1	2
19	3	4	7	10
21	1	-	1	2
25	-	1	1	1
28	1	1	2	3
36	2	1	3	5
Totals	15	13	28	43
Significant Characteristics				
31	-	2	2	2
33	1	-	1	2
Peripheral Characteristics				
34	1	-	1	2
Totals	1	-	1	2
Characteristics not related				
13	-	1	1	1
22	1	-	1	2
27	-	1	1	1
Totals	1	2	3	4

TABLE 2G-29 (continued)

	CHOICES			
CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Total	Sum
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES				
Mood Characteristics	3	3	6	9
% of total	(12.5)	(12.5)	(12.5)	(12.5)
Music Characteristics	18	17	35	53
% of total	(75.0)	(70.8)	(72.9)	(73.6)
No. of no responses	3	4	7	10
% of total	(12.5)	(16.7)	(14.6)	(13.9)

TABLE 2G-30

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 17 Second Concert
Auditors in Music Training Category III

	CHOICES			
CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS				
2	1	1	2	3
5	1	-	1	2
8	1	-	1	2
Totals	3	1	4	7
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS				
Pervading Characteristics				
9	2	1	3	5
11	-	1	1	1
14	3	2	5	8
17	1	-	1	2
19	2	2	4	6
25	2	2	4	6
28	-	1	1	1
36	2	1	3	5
Totals	12	10	22	34

TABLE 2G-30 (continued)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	CHOICES			
	First	Second	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS (continued)				
Significant Characteristics				
16	-	1	1	1
Totals	-	1	1	1
Peripheral Characteristics				
24	1	-	1	2
Totals	1	-	1	2
Charadteristics not related				
18	-	1	1	1
27	1	1	2	3
Totals	1	2	3	4
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES				
Mood Characteristics	3	1	4	7
% of total	(13.6)	(4.5)	(9.1)	(10.6)
Music Characteristics	14	13	27	41
% of total	(63.6)	(59.1)	(61.4)	(62.1)
No. of no responses	5	8	13	18
% of total	(22.7)	(36.4)	(29.5)	(27.3)

TABLE 2G-31

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 17 Second Concert
Auditors in Music Training Category IV

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	CHOICES			
	First	Second	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS				
5	-	1	1	1
6	1	-	1	2
Totals	1	1	2	3

TABLE 2G-31 (continued)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	CHOICES First	Second	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS				
Pervading Characteristics				
9	1	-	1	2
14	-	1	1	1
17	-	1	1	1
19	2	1	3	5
21	-	1	1	1
25	1	-	1	2
28	1	-	1	2
36	-	2	2	2
Totals	5	6	11	16
Significant Characteristics				
16	1	-	1	2
33	1	-	1	2
Totals	2	-	2	4
Peripheral Characteristics				
NONE				
Characteristics not related				
NONE				
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES				
Mood Characteristics	1	1	2	3
% of total	(10.0)	(10.0)	(10.0)	(10.0)
Music Characteristics	7	6	13	20
% of total	(70.0)	(60.0)	(65.0)	(66.7)
No. of no responses	2	3	5	7
% of total	(20.0)	(30.0)	(25.0)	(23.3)

TABLE 2G-32

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 17 Second Concert
Auditors in Music Training Category V

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	CHOICES			
	First	Second	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS				
6	-	1	1	1
Totals	-	1	1	1
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS				
Pervading Characteristics				
9	2	1	3	5
11	1	-	1	2
14	-	2	2	2
19	2	-	2	4
20	1	-	1	2
28	-	1	1	1
Totals	6	4	10	16
Significant Characteristics				
NONE				
Peripheral Characteristics				
NONE				
Characteristics not related				
18	-	1	1	1
Totals	-	1	1	1
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES				
Mood Characteristics	-	1	1	1
% of total	(00.0)	(8.3)	(4.2)	(2.8)
Music Characteristics	6	5	11	17
% of total	(50.0)	(41.7)	(45.8)	(47.2)
No. of no responses	6	6	12	18
% of total	(50.0)	(50.0)	(50.0)	(50.0)

In general, the auditors selected music characteristics that had been previously determined to be characteristic of the composition in question. There was also a distinct tendency for those characteristics considered pervading or significant to be selected with a greater frequency. The more traditional sounding the composition, the greater the emphasis there was on mood characteristics, while the less traditional works were considered more for their music characteristics.

With the more traditional works the untrained listener tended to place a greater emphasis on the mood characteristics. However, this was not as obvious with the ten songs presented at the Second Concert. Here, there was a tendency for the song to elicit a higher percentage of mood characteristic responses.

The confusion on the part of the listener as to the difference between disjunct melodic lines, and conjunct melodic lines with a dissonant harmonic texture, was also evident to a degree.

Third Concert

The third concert of the Exposition of Contemporary American Music was presented by the College-Conservatory Brass Choir and the College-Conservatory Symphonic Wind Ensemble, Ernest N. Glover, conducting.

A total of 241 questionnaires were distributed to the audience as they entered the hall. 211 questionnaires were returned at the end of the concert, of which 126 were completely filled out and usable in the study. This constituted a fifty-two percent return of usable questionnaires.

Four compositions were performed, two works by the College-Conservatory Brass Choir, and two by the College-Conservatory Symphonic Wind Ensemble. The compositions performed were:

1. Chorale-Partita for Brass and Percussion
   Lewis Rowell
2. Music for Brass Wallingford Riegger
   College-Conservatory Brass Choir
   Ernest N. Glover, Conductor
3. "Specifics" Scott Huston
4. Variants on a Mediaeval Tune
   Norman Dello Joio
   College-Conservatory Symphonic Wind Ensemble
   Ernest N. Glover, Conductor

Analysis of the data in terms of the independent variable, Occupation. Table 3A indicates the distribution of the auditors forming the sample for the Third Concert in terms of their Occupation. An examination of Table 3A points out that there are only three groups which are large enough to be of significance in the analysis of the data, namely, "elementary or high school teacher, "other professionals," and "college students." The other occupational groupings are too small to be of any value in the statistical analysis and are included for general information.

Tables 3A-1 through 3A-4 list the preference responses in terms of Occupation for each of the four composition performed.

The F score for Composition # 1 (Rowell - Chorale-Partita) was 2.268, which was significant at the .950 level. The basis for the significant difference was evident in the high mean responses of the "college student" group. The reason for the higher mean response of this group was essentially the significantly larger number of "+2" responses from the auditors making up the "college student" group. (See Table 3A-1)

A similar situation existed in the case of Composition # 3 (Huston - Specifics). Here the F score was 2.843, which was significant at the .990 level. The higher mean response of the "college student" group was again due primarily to the distribution of the responses, with a significantly larger number of "+2" responses. (See Table 3A-3.)

Both Rowell and Huston are highly respected members of the College-Conservatory of Music Faculty. Dr. Rowell is the Assistant Dean and has the overall responsibility for the music theory curriculum. Dr. Huston is highly regarded as a teacher of music theory and composition. The significantly larger number of "+2" responses by the "college student" group for both Compositions # 1 and # 3 suggests that a sense of a closer relationship with Rowell and Huston by the college students present had an effect on their reactions to compositions by the two men.

Responses to Composition # 2 (Riegger - Music for Brass) and Composition # 4 (Dello Joio - Variants) produced F scores which were not significant. (See Tables 3A-2 and 3A-4.)

TABLE 3A

Occupations of Auditors - Third Concert

Occupation	Number
college professor	8
elementary or high school teacher	19
musician	9
other professionals	24
proprietor, manager	3
dealer	1
clerk, office worker	9
foreman, skilled labor	2
college student	51
total	126

TABLE 3A-1

Preference Responses in Terms of Occupation
Composition # 1 Third Concert

F score - 2.268 - significant at the .950 level

OCCUPATION	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
college professor	2	3	1	2	0	0.6250
elem./h.s. teacher	2	12	1	3	1	0.5789
musician	2	5	0	2	0	0.7778
other professionals	4	15	3	2	0	0.8750
proprietor, manager	1	2	0	0	0	1.3333
dealer	0	1	0	0	0	1.0000
clerk, office worker	2	5	0	2	0	0.7778
foreman, skilled labor	1	0	1	0	0	1.0000
college student	21	23	3	2	2	1.1569

TABLE 3A-2

Preference Responses in Terms of Occupation
Composition # 2 Third Concert

F score - .764 - not significant

OCCUPATION	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
college professor	2	4	0	1	1	0.6250
elem./h.s. teacher	6	5	4	3	1	0.6316
musician	1	3	2	3	0	0.2222
other professionals	6	6	3	7	2	0.2917
proprietor, manager	0	0	0	2	1	-1.3333
dealer	0	0	0	1	0	-1.0000
clerk, office worker	0	3	3	2	1	-0.1111
foreman,skilled labor	1	0	1	0	0	1.0000
college student	7	21	11	9	3	0.3922

TABLE 3A-3

Preference Responses in Terms of Occupation
Composition # 3 Third Concert

F score - 2.843 - significant at the .990 level

OCCUPATION	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
college professor	2	5	0	1	0	1.0000
elem./h.s. teacher	7	5	5	1	1	0.8421
musician	2	6	1	0	0	1.1111
other professionals	5	11	6	1	1	0.7500
proprietor, manager	0	0	0	1	2	-1.6667
dealer	1	0	0	0	0	2.0000
clerk, office worker	0	4	3	2	0	0.2222
foreman,skilled labor	1	1	0	0	0	1.5000
college student	27	16	5	3	0	1.3137

TABLE 3A-4

Preference Responses in Terms of Occupation
Composition # 4 Third Concert

F score - .771 - not significant

OCCUPATION	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
college professor	4	3	0	1	0	1.2500
elem/h.s. teacher	14	3	1	1	0	1.5789
musician	6	2	0	1	0	1.4444
other professionals	19	4	1	0	0	1.7500
proprietor, manager	1	1	1	0	0	1.0000
dealer	1	0	0	0	0	2.0000
foreman,skilled labor	2	0	0	0	0	2.0000
clerk, office worker	5	1	2	1	0	1.1111
college student	41	8	1	1	0	1.7451

Analysis of the data in terms of the independent variable, Age Level. Table 3B indicates the distribution of the auditors forming the sample for the Third Concert in terms of their Age Level. An examination of the table showed three age groups which were too small to be of any real value in the statistical analysis of the data, namely, the "46 - 55", "56 - 65", and "66 or over" groups. The data for these groups were included for general information.

Tables 3B-1 through 3B-4 list the preference responses in terms of Age Level for each of the four compositions performed.

The F score for Composition # 1 (Rowell - Chorale-Partita) was 2.343, which was significant at the .900 level. The basis for the significant difference was found in the higher mean responses of the auditors forming the groups "21 or under," and "36 - 45." In both cases the distribution of responses was skewed more towards the "+2" and "+1" responses. Also a factor in the significant difference were the relatively low mean responses in the three oldest age groupings. While these groupings were not individually of statistical value, collectively their low mean responses did provide an additional basis for significant difference. (See Table 3B-1.)

The F score for Composition # 2(Riegger - Music for Brass) was .328, which was not significant. (See Table 3B-2.)

For Composition # 3 (Huston - Specifics), the F score was 5.560, which was significant at the .995 level. The high mean responses for the two youngest age groups provided the basis for the significant difference. The larger number of auditors in these two groups who indicated "+2" responses, together with a generally favorable distribution, accounted for the high mean response. The high mean response of the "56 - 65" age group is of no real significance, although it did provide a basis for conjecture. (See Table 3B-3.)

The responses to Composition # 4 (Dello Joio - Variants) produced an F score of 1.458, which was significant at the .750 level. This limited significant difference was readily accounted for by the high mean response of the "21 or under" age group, which had an unusually high number of "+2" responses. (See Table 3B-4.)

Again the fact that those in the younger age groups were more familiar with composers Rowell and Huston probably significantly affected the responses in terms of Age Level. Another point worthy of consideration at this point was the indication that the younger auditors tended to respond more favorably to music for wind and percussion instruments. This was indicated to some degree in the responses to Composition # 4.

TABLE 3B

Age Levels of Auditors - Third Concert

Age Group	Number
21 or under	37
22 - 25	29
26 - 35	26
36 - 45	15
46 - 55	7
56 - 65	7
66 or over	5
total	126

TABLE 3B-1

Preference Responses in Terms of Age
Composition # 1 Second Concert

F score - 2.343 - significant at the .900 level

AGE GROUP	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
21 or under	14	19	1	2	1	1.1622
22 - 25	11	11	3	3	1	0.9655
26 - 35	3	19	1	3	0	0.8462
36 - 45	6	8	1	0	0	1.3333
46 - 55	0	5	1	0	1	0.4286
56 - 65	1	2	1	3	0	0.1429
66 or over	0	2	1	2	0	0.0000

TABLE 3B-2

Preference Responses in Terms of Age
Composition # 2 Third Concert

F score - .328 - not significant

AGE GROUP	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
21 or under	5	14	7	8	3	0.2703
22 - 25	6	13	4	6	0	0.6552
26 - 35	4	8	7	5	2	0.2692
36 - 45	5	1	4	3	2	0.2667
46 - 55	1	3	0	2	1	0.1429
56 - 65	1	2	1	3	0	0.1429
66 or over	1	1	1	1	1	0.0000

TABLE 3B-3

Preference Responses in Terms of Age
Composition # 3 Third Concert

F score - 5.560 - significant at the .995 level

AGE GROUP	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
21 or under	20	13	3	1	0	1.4054
22 - 25	15	11	2	1	0	1.3793
26 - 35	4	10	7	4	1	0.4615
36 - 45	2	8	3	1	1	0.6000
46 - 55	1	1	3	0	2	0.1429
56 - 65	2	4	1	0	0	1.1429
66 or over	1	1	1	2	0	0.2000

TABLE 3B-4

Preference Responses in Terms of Age
Composition # 4 Third Concert

F score - 1.458 - significant at the .750 level

AGE GROUP	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
21 or under	35	2	0	0	0	1.9459
22 - 25	18	7	1	3	0	1.3793
26 - 35	17	6	2	1	0	1.5000
36 - 45	11	2	1	1	0	1.5333
46 - 55	3	3	1	0	0	1.2857
56 - 65	6	1	0	0	0	1.8571
66 or over	3	1	1	0	0	1.4000

Analysis of the data in terms of the independent variable, Music Training. Table 3C indicates the distribution of the auditors forming the sample for the Third Concert in terms of their formal music training. The distribution was such that all five categories were of value in the statistical treatment of the data.

Tables 3C-1 through 3C-4 list the preference responses in terms of formal music training for each of the four compositions performed.

As the F score of .000 (which was not significant) indicated, the responses to Composition # 1 (Rowell - Chorale-Partita) were not significantly different. An examination of Table 3C-1 indicated there was no distinguishable pattern to the mean responses of the five categories.

The F score for Composition # 2(Riegger - Music for Brass) was 1.738, which was significant at the .750 level. Here the mean responses of each of the categories tended to follow the curve pattern previously mentioned (in the discussion relating to the first and second concerts) with the apex found in the mean response of the auditors forming Category IV. The low mean response of those in Category III was the result of a relatively large number of "0" responses (undecided, no opinion). This composition stressed the use of dissonant tone clusters (played by ten instruments), a stylistic treatment which would be better understood by those with more extensive formal music training.

The responses to Composition # 3 (Huston - Specifics) produced an F score of 1.145, which was significant at the .500 level. While the significance of the difference was limited, the tendency for the mean responses to follow a curve with the apex at Category IV was again evident.

In the analysis of the responses to Composition # 4 (Dello Joio - Variants), an F score of 2.224 was obtained, which was significant at the .900 level. The curve of mean responses was distorted in the sense that there were two apexes, at Categories III and V. The high ratio of "+2" responses in each of these categories accounted for the high mean responses. The unusually high mean responses by those in Category V can be explained by the fact that Dello Joio had skillfully utilized a well known melody in a variational formal structure which could readily elicit favorable responses from those with the highest degree of music training. His effective use of the "band" medium could account for the high mean response of those in Category III.

The data again suggests that those with no or limited formal music training did not tend to react as favorably to the music heard, as did those with a more extensive training. Also, generally those with the most extensive training were more likely to be somewhat conservative in the responses, when compared with those who had a little less formal training.

TABLE 3C

Music Training of Auditors - Third Concert

Music Training Category	Number
I	28
II	47
III	20
IV	15
V	16
Total	126

TABLE 3C-1

Preference Responses in Terms of Music Training
Composition # 1 Second Concert

F score - .000 - not significant

MUSIC TRAINING CATEGORY	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
I	7	16	1	2	2	0.8571
II	15	21	6	5	0	0.9787
III	4	14	0	2	0	1.0000
IV	4	7	1	3	0	0.8000
V	5	8	1	1	1	0.9375

TABLE 3C-2

Preference Responses in Terms of Music Training
Composition # 2 Third Concert

F score - 1.738 - significant at the .750 level

MUSIC TRAINING CATEGORY	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
I	3	9	6	7	3	0.0714
II	11	15	4	11	6	0.2979
III	1	5	8	6	0	0.0500
IV	4	8	1	2	0	0.9333
V	4	5	5	2	0	0.6875

TABLE 3C-3

Preference Responses in Terms of Music Training
Composition # 3 Third Concert

F score - 1.145 - significant at the .500 level

MUSIC TRAINING CATEGORY	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
I	10	8	5	2	3	0.7143
II	13	23	7	4	0	0.9577
III	7	8	2	3	0	0.9500
IV	9	5	1	0	0	1.5333
V	6	4	5	0	1	0.8750

TABLE 3C-4

Preference Responses in Terms of Music Training
Composition # 4 Third Concert

F score - 2.224 - significant at the .900 level

MUSIC TRAINING CATEGORY	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
I	17	5	3	3	0	1.2857
II	35	10	1	1	0	1.6809
III	18	1	1	0	0	1.8500
IV	9	4	1	1	0	1.4000
V	14	2	0	0	0	1.8750

Analysis of the data in terms of the independent variable, Educational Attainment. Table 3D indicates the distribution of the auditors forming the sample for the Third Concert in terms of Educational Attainment. While there was a heavy concentration of auditors in the "attended college,didn't graduate" and "college graduate" groups, the "received master's degree" group was also large enough to be of value in the analysis of the data. The group, "received doctor's degree," was of a size which could be of limited significance. The remaining two groups were too small to be of any real value, and were included for general information.

Tables 3D-1 through 3D-4 list the preference responses in terms of Educational Attainment for each of the four compositions.

The responses to the first two compositions, in terms of Educational Attainment, were not statistically significant. In both cases the differences in mean responses, among the four groups which were large enough to be considered, were too small to be significant. (See Tables 3D-1 and 3D-2.)

The F score for Composition # 3 (uston - Specifics) was 1.394, which was significant at the .750 level. The high mean response of the "attended college, didn't graduate" group provided the basis for the significant difference. The unusually large number of "+2" responses in this group accounted for the high mean response. And since the bulk of those constituting this group were college students, their association with Huston in the student-teacher relationship was again pointed up. The statistical difference here was of limited significance. (See Table 3D-3.)

The analysis of the responses to Composition # 4 (Dello Joio - Variants) produced an F score of .686, which was not significant. (See Table 3D-4.)

TABLE 3D

Educational Attainment of Auditors - Third Concert

Educational Attainment	Number
attended high school,didn't graduate	2
high school graduate	5
attended college, didn't graduate	50
college graduate	40
received master's degree	19
received doctor's degree	10
Total	126

TABLE 3D-1

Preference Responses in Terms of Educational Attainment
Composition # 1 Third Concert

F score - .495 - not significant

EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
att. h.s.,didn't grad.	1	1	0	0	0	1.5000
high school graduate	3	2	0	0	0	1.6000
att. coll.,didn't grad.	14	27	5	3	1	1.0000
college graduate	13	18	3	4	2	0.9000
rec'd. master's deg.	2	13	0	4	0	0.6843
rec'd. doctor's deg.	2	5	1	2	0	0.7000

TABLE 3D-2

Preference Responses in Terms of Educational Attainment
Composition # 2 Third Concert

F score - .328 - not significant

EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
att.h.s.,didn't grad.	1	1	0	0	0	1.5000
high school graduate	0	2	2	1	0	0.2000
att.coll.,didn't grad.	8	17	11	9	5	0.2800
college graduate	8	15	4	10	3	0.3750
rec'd. master's deg.	4	4	7	4	0	0.4211
rec'd. doctor's deg.	2	3	0	4	1	0.1000

TABLE 3D-3

Preference Responses in Terms of Educational Attainment
Composition # 3 Third Concert

F score - 1.394 - significant at the .750 level

EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
att. h.s.,didn't grad.	2	0	0	0	0	2.0000
high school graduate	1	3	0	1	0	0.8000
att. coll., didn't grad.	23	17	9	1	0	1.2400
college graduate	13	14	6	4	3	0.7500
rec'd. master's degree	3	10	3	2	1	0.6316
rec'd. doctor's degree	3	4	2	1	0	0.9000

TABLE 3D-4

Preference Responses in Terms of Educational Attainment
Composition # 4 Third Concert

F score - .686 - not significant

EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
att. h.s.,didn't grad.	2	0	0	0	0	2.0000
high school graduate	2	1	1	1	0	0.8000
att.coll.,didn't grad.	41	7	2	0	0	1.7800
college graduate	27	9	1	3	0	1.5000
rec'd. master's degree	14	3	2	0	0	1.6316
rec'd. doctor's degree	7	2	0	1	0	1.5000

Analysis of the data in terms of the independent variable, Familiarity. Tables 3E-1 through 3E-4 list the preference responses to the Familiarity Scale for the four compositions of the Third Concert. Again, with one exception, the distribution was heavily skewed towards unfamiliarity. Thus, any conclusions drawn as a result of the statistical analysis must be viewed with caution.

The responses to Compositions # 1 and # 4, in terms of Familiarity, were not significantly different. It was also of importance to note, especially in the case of Composition # 4, that the responses were better distributed among the three degrees of familiarity-unfamiliarity. Hence the lack of any significant difference, in terms of familiarity, is in itself noteworthy.

The F score for Composition # 2 (Riegger - Music for Brass) was 2.073, which was significant at the .900 level. However, the number of auditors who indicated that they were familiar with the work, or were not sure whether the work was familiar, was too small to be of any real statistical value. Hence the wide difference in mean responses between "familiarity" and "unfamiliar" was of no real value.

The F score for Composition # 3 (Huston - Specifics) was 1.376, which was significant at the .750 level. The high mean response of those who indicated "familiarity" provided the basis for the significant difference. However, the skewing of the responses towards "unfamiliar", together with the relatively low level of significance, provided little useful information.

TABLE 3E-1

Preference Responses in Terms of Familiarity
Composition # 1 Third Concert

F score - .000 - not significant

DEGREE OF FAMILIARITY	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
Familiar A (24)	7	14	0	2	1	1.0000
Not sure B (20)	4	12	2	2	0	0.9000
Unfamiliar C (82)	24	40	7	9	2	0.9146

TABLE 3E-2

Preference Responses in Terms of Familiarity
Composition # 2 Third Concert

F score - 2.073 - significant at the .900 level

DEGREE OF FAMILIARITY	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
Familiar A (7)	4	2	0	1	0	1.2857
Not sure B (7)	1	2	0	4	0	0.0000
Unfamiliar C (112)	18	38	24	23	9	0.2946

TABLE 3E-3

Preference Responses in Terms of Familiarity
Composition # 3 Third Concert

F score - 1.376 - significant at the .750 level

DEGREE OF FAMILIARITY	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
Familiar A (17)	9	6	2	0	0	1.4118
Not sure B (17)	5	7	2	2	1	0.7647
Unfamiliar C (92)	31	35	16	7	3	0.9130

TABLE 3E-4

Preference Responses in Terms of Familiarity
Composition # 4 Third Concert

F score - .000 - not significant

DEGREE OF FAMILIARITY	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
Familiar A (37)	27	7	0	3	0	1.5676
Not sure B (25)	18	4	1	2	0	1.5200
Unfamiliar C (64)	48	11	5	0	0	1.6719

Analysis of the data in terms of preference responses. Table 3F indicates the summary of preference responses to each composition performed at the Third Concert.

In comparing the responses to Composition # 1 (Rowell - Chorale-Partita) and Composition # 3 (Huston - Specifics), the _t_ score was .253, which was not significant. Therefore, there was no significant difference in the manner in which the auditors responded to these two compositions. While the two works were written for two different mediums of performance, and stylistically, were somewhat different, the lack of significant difference in preference responses supported the contention that their relationship with the auditors did tend to affect the manner in which the auditors did respond to their works.

Composition # 4 (Dello Joio - Variants) stylistically was traditional. Although it employed dissonance (in a peripheral sense) and certain twentieth century tonal and rhythmic effects, Dello Joio's use of a familiar tune which was readily recognizable in each of the variations together with an orderly formal structure which could be comprehended in the traditional sense, produced an overall feeling that the composition was traditional sounding. This is supported by the very favorable response the work received. In comparing Composition # 4 with the other three compositions the following t values were computed (all significant at the .995 level): Between Compositions # 4 and # 1 - 5.858; between Compositions # 4 and # 2 - 10.240; and between Compositions # 4 and # 3 - 5.500. Thus the more traditional sounding composition did elicit responses from the auditors which were significantly different.

On the other hand Composition # 2 (Riegger - Music for Brass), with its emphasis on dissonance and the use of tone clusters, was received less favorably by the auditors. The significant difference between the responses to Compositions # 2 and # 4 were noted in the preceding paragraph. In comparing Composition # 2 with Compositions # 1 and # 3, the following t values were also significant at the .995 level: Between Compositions # 1 and # 2 - 4.512, and between Compositions # 2 and # 2 - 4.726.

The auditors responded most favorably to that composition which was more closely related to traditional music concepts. They responded much less favorably to the composition which was stylistically more closely related to twentieth century concepts. Stylistically the works by Rowell and Huston were in the middle. The auditors indicated such by their responses.

TABLE 3F

Summary of Preference Responses for each Composition
Third Concert

COMPOSITION	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean	Standard Deviation
1	35	66	9	13	3	0.9286	0.9800
2	23	42	24	28	9	0.3333	1.2100
3	45	48	20	9	4	0.9603	1.0300
4	93	22	6	5	0	1.6111	0.7500

Analysis of the responses to the Index of Stylistic Characteristics. The responses to the Index of Stylistic Characteristics were examined in relation to the stylistic analyses of the compositions performed. (See Appendix G for the complete stylistic analyses of the works performed at the Third Concert.)

Tables 3G-1 through 3G-6 contain the summary of responses for Composition # 1 (Rowell - Chorale-Partita). (The overall summary is contained in Table 3G-1.) Approximately fifty-two percent of the auditors selected a mood characteristic as a first choice. However, the number of mood characteristics selected as second and third choices was much smaller. If the auditors felt that the mood was important they were most likely to select it as a first choice. There was a high degree of agreement as to the mood of the work. The mood characteristic selected most frequently was "dramatic, agitated, exciting, triumphant" (7). The second and only other mood characteristic selected with any significant degree of frequency was "majestic, martial, vigorous" (8).

By contrast only forty-seven percent of the auditors selected a music characteristic as a first choice. However, the emphasis was on music characteristics as second and third choices. There was less agreement on the music characteristics which were most important. 27 music characteristics were selected at least once. Those selected frequently enough to be considered significant were as follows, with the one selected most frequently first:

14. dissonant sounds
31. dynamic contrast of music
16. masses or blocks of sound
18. orderliness of structure
28. wind instrument color
33. percussive rhythms
9. irregular melodic contour, disjointed (angular).

Of those most frequently selected only "irregular melodic contrast, disjointed" (9) was a characteristic not related to the composition, Again some of the auditors mistook conjunct melody supported by dissonant sonorities as being a disjointed melodic line.

Those auditors with no or only limited formal music training tended to place more emphasis on the mood characteristics. As the extent of formal music training increased they tended to select the music characteristics more frequently as a first choice. Auditors in Category IV selected music characteristics more frequently than did those in Category V.

TABLE 3G-1

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 1 Third Concert
Overall Summary

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS					
1	3	1	2	6	13
2	4	3	1	8	19
3	0	0	1	1	1
4	0	1	0	1	2
6	3	1	1	5	12
7	36	8	6	50	130
8	19	8	6	33	79
Totals	65	22	17	104	256
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS					
Pervading Characteristics					
14	13	13	8	34	73
28	4	6	4	14	28
31	4	11	10	25	44
33	2	9	3	14	27
34	1	3	5	9	14
37	1	0	0	1	1
Totals	25	42	30	97	189
Significant Characteristics					
12	1	5	1	7	14
16	4	4	11	19	31
18	7	4	3	14	32
21	6	3	2	11	26
25	-	-	1	1	1
26	-	-	3	3	3
32	3	6	10	19	31
Totals	21	22	31	74	138

TABLE 3G-1 (continued)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.		CHOICES			
	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS (continued)					
Peripheral Characteristics					
10	-	1	1	2	3
22	0	1	0	1	2
Totals	0	1	0	1	5
Characteristics not related					
9	6	4	4	14	30
11	1	3	1	5	10
13	1	1	3	5	6
15	1	2	1	4	8
17	1	1	1	3	6
19	-	1	4	5	6
20	-	2	-	2	4
23	1	5	2	8	15
24	-	1	-	1	2
27	2	1	3	6	11
35	-	-	1	1	1
36	-	4	5	9	13
Totals	13	25	25	63	114
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES					
Mood Characteristics	65	22	17	104	256
% of total	(51.6)	(17.4)	(13.5)	(27.5)	
Music Characteristics	59	91	87	237	446
% of total	(46.8)	(72.2)	(69.1)	(62.7)	
No. of no responses	2	13	22	37	54
% of total	(1.6)	(10.4)	(17.4)	(9.8)	

TABLE 3G-2

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 1 Third Concert
Auditors in Music Training Category I

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	CHOICES			Total	Sum
	First	Second	Third		
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS					
1	-	-	1	1	1
2	-	1	1	2	3
3	-	-	1	1	1
4	-	1	-	1	2
6	1	-	-	1	33
7	8	4	-	12	32
8	5	2	1	8	20
Totals	14	8	4	26	62
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS					
Pervading Characteristics					
14	2	3	2	7	14
28	1	1	1	3	6
31	-	2	1	3	5
33	1	2	-	3	7
34	-	1	1	2	3
37	1	-	-	1	3
Totals	5	9	5	19	38
Significant Characteristics					
12	-	-	1	1	1
16	2	-	2	4	8
18	1	1	1	3	6
25	-	-	1	1	1
32	1	3	-	4	9
Totals	4	4	5	13	25
Peripheral Characteristics					
10	-	-	1	1	1
Totals	-	-	1	1	1

TABLE 3G-2 (continued)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS (continued)					
Characteristics not related					
9	2	1	-	3	8
11	1	1	-	2	5
13	-	-	1	1	1
17	1	-	-	1	1
19	-	-	2	2	2
20	-	1	-	1	2
23	-	1	1	2	3
27	1	-	1	2	4
35	-	-	1	1	1
36	-	1	-	1	2
Totals	5	5	6	16	31
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES					
Mood Characteristics	14	8	4	26	62
% of total	(50.0)	(28.6)	(14.3)	(31.0)	
Music Characteristics	14	18	17	49	95
% of total	(50.0)	(64.3)	(60.7)	(58.3)	
No. of no responses	-	2	7	9	11
% of total	(0.0)	(7.1)	(25.0)	(10.7)	

TABLE 3G-3

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 1 Third Concert
Auditors in Music Training Category II

	CHOICES				
CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS					
1	1	1	1	3	6
2	3	-	-	3	9
6	1	1	-	2	5
7	15	2	4	21	53
8	6	5	3	14	31
Totals	26	9	8	43	104

TABLE 3G-3 (continued)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS					
Pervading Characteristics					
14	4	6	6	16	30
28	1	2	2	6	9
31	4	4	4	12	24
33	1	5	1	7	14
3	-	1	1	2	3
Totals	10	18	14	42	80
Significant Characteristics					
12	-	3	-	3	6
16	2	-	5	7	11
18	2	2	-	4	10
21	4	1	1	6	15
26	-	-	2	2	2
32	-	3	6	9	12
Totals	8	9	14	31	56
Peripheral Characteristics					
NONE					
Characteristics not related					
9	2	1	1	4	9
11	-	1	-	1	2
15	1	-	-	1	3
17	-	1	-	1	2
19	-	-	1	1	1
23	-	3	1	4	7
27	-	1	-	1	2
36	-	1	3	4	5
Totals	3	8	6	17	31
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES					
Mood Characteristics	26	9	8	43	104
% of total	(55.3)	(19.2)	(17.0)	(30.5)	
Music Characteristics	21	35	34	90	167
% of total	(44.7)	(74.5)	(72.3)	(63.8)	
No. of no responses	-	3	5	8	11
% of total	(00.0)	(6.3)	(10.7)	(5.7)	

TABLE 3G-4

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 1 Third Concert
Auditors in Music Training Category III

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	CHOICES				
	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS					
7	7	-	1	8	22
8	5	1	1	7	18
Totals	12	1	2	15	40
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS					
Pervading Characteristics					
14	2	2	-	4	10
28	-	2	-	2	4
31	-	3	1	4	7
33	-	2	-	2	4
34	-	1	-	1	2
Totals	2	10	1	13	27
Significant Characteristics					
16	-	1	3	4	5
18	2	-	1	3	7
21	1	1	-	2	5
32	1	-	3	4	6
Totals	4	2	7	13	23
Peripheral Characteristics					
NONE					
Characteristics not related					
9	1	2	3	6	10
11	-	1	1	2	3
13	-	1	-	1	2
19	-	1	1	2	3
27	1	-	1	2	4
36	-	-	1	1	1
Totals	2	5	7	14	23

TABLE 3G-4 (continued)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES					
Mood Characteristics	12	1	2	15	40
% of total	(60.0)	(5.0)	(10.0)	(25.0)	
Music Characteristics	8	17	15	40	73
% of total	(40.0)	(85.0)	(75.0)	(66.7)	
No. of no responses	-	2	3	5	7
% of total	(00.0)	(10.0)	(15.0)	(8.3)	

TABLE 3G-5

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 1 Third Concert
Auditors in Music Training Category IV

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	CHOICES Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS					
1	1	-	-	1	3
2	1	1	-	2	5
6	-	-	1	1	1
7	2	-	-	2	6
8	1	-	1	2	4
Totals	5	1	2	8	19
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS					
Pervading Characteristics					
14	4	1	-	5	14
31	-	-	2	2	2
34	-	-	1	1	1
Totals	4	1	3	8	17

TABLE 3G-5 (continued)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS (continued)					
Significant Characteristics					
12	-	1	-	1	2
16	-	2	-	2	2
18	1	1	-	2	5
21	1	-	-	1	3
32	-	-	1	1	1
Totals	2	4	1	7	15
Peripheral Characteristics					
N O N E					
Characteristics not related					
9	1	-	-	1	3
13	-	-	1	1	1
15	-	2	-	2	4
17	-	-	1	1	1
20	-	1	-	1	2
23	1	1	-	2	5
27	-	-	1	1	1
Totals	2	4	3	9	17
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES					
Mood Characteristics	5	1	2	8	19
% of total	(33.3)	(6.7)	(13.3)	(17.8)	
Music Characteristics	8	9	7	24	49
% of total	(53.3)	(60.0)	(46.7)	(53.3)	
No. of no responses	2	5	6	13	22
% of total	(13.4)	(33.3)	(40.0)	(28.9)	

TABLE 3G-6

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 1 Third Concert
Auditors in Music Training Category V

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	CHOICES First	 Second	 Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS					
1	1	-	-	1	3
2	-	1	-	1	2
6	1	-	-	1	3
7	4	2	1	7	17
8	2	-	-	2	6
Totals	8	3	1	12	31
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS					
Pervading Characteristics					
14	1	1	-	2	5
28	2	1	1	4	9
31	-	2	2	4	6
33	-	-	2	2	2
34	1	-	2	3	5
Totals	4	4	7	15	27
Significant Characteristics					
12	1	1	-	2	5
16	-	1	1	2	3
18	1	-	1	2	4
21	-	1	1	2	3
26	-	-	1	1	1
32	1	-	-	1	3
Totals	3	3	4	10	19
Peripheral Characteristics					
10	-	1	-	1	2
22	-	1	-	1	2
Totals	-	2	-	2	4

TABLE 3G-6 (continued)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS (continued)					
Characteristics not related					
13	1	-	1	2	4
15	-	-	1	1	1
24	-	1	-	1	2
36	-	2	1	3	5
Totals	1	3	3	7	12
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES					
Mood Characteristics	8	3	1	12	31
% of total	(50.0)	(18.8)	(6.3)	(25.0)	
Music Characteristics	8	12	14	34	62
% of total	(50.0)	(75.0)	(87.4)	(70.8)	
No. of no responses	-	1	1	2	3
% of total	(00.0)	(6.2)	(6.3)	(4.2)	

Tables 3G-7 through 3G-12 contain the summary of responses to stylistic characteristics for Composition # 2 (Riegger - Music for Brass). (The overall summary is contained in Table 3G-7.) The auditors placed much less emphasis on the mood characteristics of this work. Only sixteen percent selected a mood characteristic as a first choice. And there was an even less emphasis on mood characteristics as second and third choices. Two mood characteristics were selected by at least ten percent of the auditors. They were "dramatic, agitated, exciting, triumphant" (7) and "heavy, gloomy, pathetic" (2).

A much greater emphasis was placed on music characteristics. Eighty-three percent of the auditors selected a music characteristic as a first choice. They continued to emphasize music characteristics as second and third choices. 27 music characteristics were selected at least once. Seven were selected with enough frequency to be considered significant. They were (with the one selected most frequently listed first):

14. dissonant sounds
16. masses or blocks of sounds
27. strange orchestral effects (relating to tone clusters played by groups of ten instruments)
9. irregular melodic contour, disjointed (angular)
28. wind instrument color
31. dynamic contrast of music
19. disjointed series of sounds (pointillistic).

Three of the four pervading characteristics of this work were selected frequently enough to be considered significant. They were 14, 16 and 28.

Again the tendency to select mood characteristics was more closely related to lack of formal music training, and the tendency to select music characteristics was related to the extent of formal music training. (See Tables 3G-9 through 3G-12.)

TABLE 3G-7

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 2 Third Concert
Overall Summary

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	CHOICES First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS					
1	1	-	-	1	3
2	9	2	2	13	35
5	-	1	-	1	2
7	5	8	8	21	39
8	5	2	1	8	20
Totals	20	13	11	44	97

TABLE 3G-7 (continued)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS					
Pervading Characteristics					
14	36	21	13	70	163
16	19	8	12	39	85
20	5	3	1	9	22
28	4	8	2	14	30
Totals	64	40	28	132	300
Significant Characteristics					
9	10	13	3	26	59
11	1	2	4	7	11
12	4	-	2	6	14
18	-	1	2	3	4
21	-	3	2	5	8
25	-	4	2	6	10
27	12	13	11	36	73
31	3	3	7	13	22
35	-	2	2	4	6
36	-	1	4	5	6
Totals	30	42	39	111	213
Peripheral Characteristics					
19	3	5	4	12	23
32	2	-	1	3	7
34	-	1	2	3	4
Totals	5	6	7	18	34
Characteristics not related					
13	1	3	2	6	11
15	2	1	-	3	7
17	2	4	4	10	18
22	-	1	-	1	2
23	-	3	5	8	11
26	-	1	-	1	2
29	-	1	-	1	2
30	-	1	-	1	2
33	-	-	1	1	1
37	-	1	-	1	2
Totals	5	16	12	33	58

TABLE 3G-7 (continued)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES					
Mood Characteristics	20	13	11	44	97
% of total	(15.8)	(10.3)	(8.7)	(11.6)	
Music Characteristics	104	104	86	294	606
% of total	(82.5)	(82.5)	(68.3)	(77.8)	
No. of no responses	2	9	29	40	53
% of total	(1.6)	(7.2)	(23.0)	(10.6)	

TABLE 3G-8

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 2 Third Concert
Auditors in Music Training Category I

CHARACTERISTIC NO.		CHOICES			
	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS					
1	1	-	-	1	3
2	4	1	-	5	14
5	-	1	-	1	2
7	1	3	3	7	12
8	3	-	-	3	9
Totals	9	5	3	17	40
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS					
Pervading Characteristics					
14	6	2	4	12	26
16	1	-	1	2	4
20	2	1	-	3	8
28	-	1	-	1	2
Totals	9	4	5	18	40

TABLE 3G-8 (continued)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS (continued)					
Significant Characteristics					
9	3	2	2	7	15
11	-	-	1	1	1
18	-	1	-	1	2
21	-	-	1	1	1
25	-	1	1	2	3
27	2	3	-	5	12
31	2	-	2	4	8
35	-	1	1	2	3
Totals	7	8	8	23	45
Peripheral Characteristics					
19	-	1	2	3	4
32	-	-	1	1	1
Totals	-	1	3	4	5
Characteristics not related					
13	-	2	1	3	5
17	1	2	1	4	8
23	-	-	1	1	1
Totals	1	4	3	8	14
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES					
Mood Characteristics	9	5	3	17	40
% of total	(32.1)	(17.9)	(10.7)	(20.0)	
Music Characteristics	17	18	19	54	106
% of total	(60.7)	(64.3)	(67.9)	(63.1)	
No. of no responses	2	5	6	13	22
% of total	(7.2)	(17.8)	(21.4)	(16.7)	

TABLE 3G-9

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 2 Third Concert
Auditors in Music Training Category II

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	CHOICES First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS					
2	1	1	-	2	5
7	2	2	1	5	11
8	2	2	-	4	10
Totals	5	5	1	11	26
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS					
Pervading Characteristics					
14	15	7	2	24	61
16	8	6	6	20	42
20	3	1	1	5	12
28	2	3	1	6	13
Totals	28	17	10	55	128
Significant Characteristics					
9	3	5	1	9	20
11	-	-	1	1	1
12	-	-	1	1	1
18	-	-	2	2	2
21	-	3	1	4	7
25	-	2	-	2	4
27	6	4	5	15	31
31	-	2	4	6	8
35	-	-	1	1	1
36	-	1	2	3	4
Totals	9	17	18	44	79
Peripheral Characteristics					
19	1	-	1	2	4
32	2	-	-	2	6
34	-	1	1	2	3
Totals	3	1	2	6	13

TABLE 3G-9 (continued)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS (continued)					
Characteristics not related					
13	1	1	-	2	5
15	1	-	-	1	3
17	-	-	1	1	1
23	-	2	1	3	5
26	-	1	-	1	2
30	-	1	-	1	2
33	-	-	1	1	1
37	-	1	-	1	2
Totals	2	6	3	11	21
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES					
Mood Characteristics	5	5	1	11	26
% of total	(10.6)	(10.6)	(2.1)	(7.8)	
Music Characteristics	42	41	33	116	241
% of total	(89.4)	(87.3)	(70.2)	(82.3)	
No. of no responses	-	1	13	14	15
% of total	(00.0)	(2.1)	(27.7)	(9.9)	

TABLE 3G-10

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 2 Third Concert
Auditors in Music Training Category III

	CHOICES				
CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS					
2	2	-	1	3	7
7	-	2	1	3	5
Totals	2	2	2	6	12

TABLE 3G-10 (continued)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS					
Pervading Characteristics					
14	3	4	5	12	22
16	6	-	1	7	19
28	1	1	-	2	5
Totals	10	5	6	21	46
Significant Characteristics					
9	2	2	-	4	10
11	-	1	1	2	3
12	2	-	-	2	6
27	2	4	2	9	16
Totals	6	7	3	16	35
Peripheral Characteristics					
19	1	2	-	3	7
34	-	-	1	1	1
Totals	1	2	1	4	8
Characteristics not related					
13	-	-	1	1	1
17	1	1	2	4	7
23	-	1	-	1	2
Totals	1	2	3	6	10
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES					
Mood Characteristics	2	2	2	6	12
% of total	(10.0)	(10.0)	(10.0)	(10.0)	
Music Characteristics	18	16	13	47	99
% of total	(90.0)	(80.0)	(65.0)	(78.3)	
No. of no responses	-	2	5	7	9
% of total	(00.0)	(10.0)	(25.0)	(11.7)	

TABLE 3G-11

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 2 Third Concert
Auditors in Music Training Category IV

	CHOICES				
CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS					
2	2	-	-	2	6
7	1	1	1	3	6
Totals	3	1	1	5	12
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS					
Pervading Characteristics					
14	6	4	2	12	28
16	1	1	1	3	6
20	-	1	-	1	2
28	-	-	1	1	1
Totals	7	6	4	17	37
Significant Characteristics					
9	-	2	-	2	4
11	1	1	1	3	6
12	1	-	-	1	3
27	1	1	1	3	6
31	-	1	-	1	2
35	-	1	-	1	2
36	-	-	2	2	2
Totals	3	6	4	13	25
Peripheral Characteristics					
19	1	1	1	3	6
Totals	1	1	1	3	6
Characteristics not related					
15	1	1	-	2	6
23	-	-	1	1	1
Totals	1	1	1	3	6

TABLE 3G-11 (continued)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES					
Mood Characteristics	3	1	1	5	12
% of total	(20.0)	(6.7)	(6.7)	(11.1)	
Music Characteristics	12	14	10	36	74
% of total	(80.0)	(93.3)	(66.7)	(80.0)	
No. of no responses	-	-	4	4	4
% of total	(00.0)	(00.0)	(26.6)	(8.9)	

TABLE 3G-12

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 2 Third Concert
Auditors in Music Training Category V

	CHOICES				
CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS					
2	-	-	1	1	1
7	1	-	2	3	5
8	-	-	1	1	1
Totals	1	-	4	5	7
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS					
Pervading Characteristics					
14	6	4	-	10	26
16	3	1	3	7	14
28	1	3	-	4	9
Totals	10	8	3	21	49
Significant Characteristics					
9	2	2	-	4	10
12	1	-	1	2	4
25	-	1	1	2	3
27	1	1	3	5	8
31	1	-	1	2	4
Totals	5	4	6	15	29

TABLE 3G-12 (continued)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS (continued)					
Peripheral Characteristics					
19	-	1	-	1	2
Totals	-	1	-	1	2
Characteristics not related					
17	-	1	-	1	2
22	-	1	-	1	2
23	-	-	2	2	2
Totals	-	2	2	4	6
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES					
Mood Characteristics	1	-	4	5	7
% of total	(6.3)	(00.0)	(25.0)	(10.4)	
Music Characteristics	15	15	11	41	86
% of total	(93.7)	(93.7)	(68.7)	(85.4)	
No. of no responses	-	1	1	2	3
% of total	(00.0)	(6.3)	(6.3)	(4.2)	

Tables 3G-13 through 3G-18 contain the summary of responses to stylistic characteristics for Composition # 3 (Huston - Specifics). (The overall summary is contained in Table 3G-13.) Thirty-five percent of the auditors selected a mood characteristic as a first choice. And again there was much less emphasis on mood characteristics as second and third choices. While all eight mood characteristics were selected at least three times, there were two which were selected with enough frequency to be considered significant. They were "dramatic, agitated, exciting, triumphant" (7) and "majestic, martial, vigorous" (8).

Sixty-four percent of the auditors selected music characteristics as a first choice. The emphasis on music characteristics was continued in making second and third choices. 28 music characteristics were selected at least once. There was a greater diversity in the selection of the music characteristics with eleven being selected by at least ten percent of the auditors. No one music characteristic stood out over the others. This was due primarily to the fact that there was more stylistic variety in this work than in the preceding two compositions. The eleven music characteristics selected most frequently were, in the order of frequency of selection:

14. dissonant sounds
21. interweaving of melodies (contrapuntal)
28. wind instrument color
25. cluttered texture, busy music
18. orderliness of structure
31. dynamic contrast of music
9. irregular melodic contour, disjointed (this was a characteristic not related to the work)
10. lyric melody
23. extreme pitch ranges (high-low) of the music
16. masses or blocks of sounds
36. irregular rhythms.

Both of the pervading characteristics were selected frequently enough to be considered significant, and four of the eight characteristics classified as significant characteristics of the music were included on the above listing.

There was less of a tendency to place an emphasis on the selection of mood or music characteristics as a result of the extent of formal music training in this composition than there was for the first two compositions.

TABLE 3G-13

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 3 Third Concert
Overall Summary

	CHOICES				
CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS					
1	8	1	-	9	26
2	3	-	-	3	9
3	2	2	2	6	12
4	2	1	1	4	9
5	4	-	1	4	13
6	4	4	1	9	21
7	16	7	2	25	64
8	5	4	4	13	27
Totals	44	19	11	74	181
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS					
Pervading Characteristics					
18	4	10	3	17	35
28	10	6	7	23	49
Totals	14	16	10	40	84
Significant Characteristics					
10	3	5	6	14	25
12	-	-	2	2	2
13	1	8	2	11	21
14	13	10	5	28	64
15	2	1	1	4	9
21	12	9	2	23	56
26	1	1	2	4	7
31	3	4	9	16	26
Totals	35	38	29	102	210

TABLE 3G-13 (continued)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS (continued)					
Peripheral Characteristics					
16	4	4	4	12	24
23	2	8	3	13	25
25	7	5	5	17	36
27	2	2	2	6	12
32	-	1	2	3	4
34	-	-	3	3	3
33	-	3	4	7	10
36	2	4	6	12	20
Totals	17	27	29	73	134
Characteristics not related					
9	8	5	2	15	36
11	1	-	-	1	3
17	1	4	2	7	13
19	-	-	2	2	2
20	-	-	1	1	1
22	-	1	1	2	3
24	4	1	1	6	15
29	-	1	-	1	2
35	-	1	-	1	2
37	-	-	1	1	1
Totals	14	13	10	37	78
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES					
Mood Characteristics	44	19	11	74	181
% of total	(34.9)	(15.1)	(8.7)	(19.6)	
Music Characteristics	80	94	79	253	507
% of total	(63.5)	(74.6)	(62.7)	(66.9)	
No. of no responses	2	13	36	51	68
% of total	(1.6)	(10.3)	(28.6)	(13.5)	

TABLE 3G-14

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 3 Third Concert
Auditors in Music Training Category I

CHARACTERISTIC NO.		CHOICES			
	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS					
1	2	-	-	2	6
2	2	-	-	2	6
3	1	-	1	2	4
4	2	-	-	2	6
5	2	-	-	2	6
6	-	3	1	4	7
7	1	2	1	4	8
8	-	-	1	1	1
Totals	10	5	4	19	44
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS					
Pervading Characteristics					
18	2	1	1	4	9
28	2	1	1	4	9
Totals	4	2	2	8	18
Significant Characteristics					
10	-	3	3	6	9
13	1	2	-	3	7
14	1	3	2	6	11
15	1	-	-	1	3
21	4	2	-	6	16
31	1	-	-	1	3
Totals	8	10	5	23	49
Peripheral Characteristics					
16	-	-	2	2	2
23	-	1	1	2	3
25	-	-	1	1	1
27	1	-	1	2	4
32	-	-	1	1	1
33	-	1	-	1	2
Totals	1	2	6	9	13

TABLE 3G-14 (continued)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS (continued)					
Characteristics not related					
9	3	-	-	3	9
17	-	2	1	3	5
35	-	1	-	1	2
Totals	3	3	1	7	16
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES					
Mood Characteristics	10	5	4	19	44
% of total	(35.7)	(17.9)	(14.3)	(22.6)	(26.2)
Music Characteristics	16	17	14	47	96
% of total	(57.1)	(60.7)	(50.0)	(56.0)	(57.1)
No. of no responses	2	6	10	18	28
% of total	(7.2)	(21.4)	(35.7)	(21.4)	(16.7)

TABLE 3G-15

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 3 Third Concert
Auditors in Music Training Category II

	CHOICES				
CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS					
1	3	-	-	3	9
3	1	1	1	3	6
4	-	1	1	2	3
5	2	-	-	2	6
6	3	1	-	4	11
7	9	2	1	11	29
8	3	2	3	8	16
Totals	20	7	6	38	80
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS					
Pervading Characteristics					
18	2	4	1	7	15
28	4	3	3	10	21
Totals	6	7	4	17	36

TABLE 3G-15 (continued)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS (continued)					
Significant Characteristics					
10	-	1	1	2	3
12	-	-	2	2	2
13	-	2	1	3	5
14	3	1	1	5	12
15	-	1	1	2	3
21	1	3	1	5	10
26	1	1	1	3	6
31	1	1	-	2	5
Totals	6	10	8	24	46
Peripheral Characteristics					
16	2	1	1	4	9
23	2	5	1	8	17
25	3	2	1	6	14
27	-	-	1	1	1
32	-	1	-	1	2
33	-	2	1	3	5
34	-	-	2	2	2
36	1	2	2	5	9
Totals	8	13	9	30	59
Characteristics not related					
9	3	4	-	7	17
17	-	1	1	2	3
19	-	-	2	2	2
20	-	-	1	1	1
22	-	1	-	1	2
24	4	-	-	4	12
29	-	1	-	1	2
37	-	-	1	1	1
Totals	7	7	5	19	40
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES					
Mood Characteristics	20	7	6	33	80
% of total	(42.6)	(14.9)	(12.8)	(23.4)	(28.4)
Music Characteristics	27	37	26	90	181
% of total	(57.4)	(78.8)	(55.3)	(63.8)	(64.2)
No. of no responses	-	3	15	18	21
% of total	(00.0)	(6.4)	(31.9)	(12.8)	(7.4)

TABLE 3G-16

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 3 Third Concert
Auditors in Music Training Category III

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	CHOICES First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS					
1	2	1	-	3	8
6	1	-	-	1	3
7	3	1	-	4	11
8	1	1	-	2	5
Totals	7	3	-	10	27
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS					
Pervading Characteristics					
18	-	1	-	1	2
28	2	1	-	3	8
Totals	2	2	-	4	10
Significant Characteristics					
10	1	1	1	3	6
13	-	2	-	2	4
14	2	2	-	4	10
21	2	2	-	4	10
31	-	-	5	5	5
Totals	5	7	6	18	35
Peripheral Characteristics					
16	1	1	1	3	6
23	-	2	-	2	4
25	1	-	2	3	5
27	1	1	-	2	5
33	-	-	2	2	2
34	-	-	1	1	1
36	1	-	1	2	4
Totals	4	4	7	15	27
Characteristics not related					
9	1	1	1	3	6
11	1	-	-	1	3
22	-	-	1	1	1
24	-	1	-	1	2
Totals	2	2	2	6	12

TABLE 3G-16 (continued)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES					
Mood Characteristics	7	3	-	10	27
% of total	(35.0)	(15.0)	(00.0)	(16.7)	(22.5)
Music Characteristics	13	15	15	43	84
% of total	(65.0)	(75.0)	(75.0)	(71.7)	(70.0)
No. of no responses	-	2	5	7	9
% of total	(00.0)	(10.0)	(25.0)	(11.6)	(7.5)

TABLE 3G-17

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 3 Third Concert
Auditors in Music Training Category IV

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	CHOICES				
	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS					
2	1	-	-	1	3
3	-	1	-	1	2
5	-	-	1	1	1
7	2	1	-	3	8
8	-	1	-	1	2
Totals	3	3	1	7	16
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS					
Pervading Characteristics					
18	-	2	1	3	5
Totals	-	2	1	3	5
Significant Characteristics					
10	1	-	1	2	4
13	-	2	-	2	4
14	3	2	2	7	15
15	1	-	-	1	3
21	4	-	-	4	12
26	-	-	1	1	1
31	1	-	2	3	5
Totals	10	4	6	20	44

TABLE 3G-17 (continued)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS (continued)					
Peripheral Characteristics					
16	-	1	-	1	2
25	-	2	-	2	4
27	-	-	1	1	1
32	-	-	1	1	1
33	-	-	1	1	1
36	-	1	-	1	2
Totals	-	4	3	7	11
Characteristics not related					
9	1	-	-	1	3
17	1	1	-	2	5
24	-	-	1	1	1
Totals	2	1	1	4	9
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES					
Mood Characteristics	3	3	1	7	16
% of total	(20.0)	(20.0)	(6.7)	(15.6)	(17.8)
Music Characteristics	12	11	11	34	69
% of total	(80.0)	(73.3)	(73.3)	(75.6)	(76.7)
No. of no responses	-	1	3	4	5
% of total	(00.0)	(6.7)	(20.0)	(8.8)	(5.5)

TABLE 3G-18

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics

Composition # 3 Third Concert

Auditors in Music Training Category V

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	CHOICES First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS					
1	1	-	-	1	3
7	2	1	-	3	8
8	1	-	-	1	3
Totals	4	1	-	5	14

TABLE 3G-18 (continued)

CHARACTERICTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS					
Pervading Characteristics					
18	-	2	-	2	4
28	2	1	3	6	11
Totals	2	3	3	8	15
Significant Characteristics					
10	1	-	-	1	3
13	-	-	1	1	1
14	4	2	-	6	16
21	1	2	1	4	8
31	-	3	2	5	8
Totals	6	7	4	17	36
Peripheral Characteristics					
16	1	1	-	2	5
23	-	-	1	1	1
25	3	1	1	5	12
27	-	1	-	1	2
36	-	1	3	4	5
Totals	4	4	5	13	25
Characteristics not related					
9	-	-	1	1	1
Totals	-	-	1	1	1
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES					
Mood Characteristics	4	1	-	5	14
% of total	(25.0)	(6.3)	(00.0)	(10.4)	(14.6)
Music Characteristics	12	14	13	39	77
% of total	(75.0)	(87.5)	(81.2)	(81.3)	(80.2)
No. of no responses	-	1	3	4	5
% of total	(00.0)	(6.2)	(18.8)	(8.3)	(5.2)

Tables 3G-19 through 3G-24 list the summary of responses to stylistic characteristics for Composition # 4 (Dello Joio - Variants). (The overall summary is contained in Table 2G-19.) There was a greater emphasis placed on mood characteristics in this work with forty-six percent of the auditors selecting a mood characteristic as a first choice. While the frequency of selecting a mood characteristic again decreased in terms of second and third choices, there was a greater tendency to select mood characteristics as second and third choices for this work than was found in analyzing the first three compositions. There was also a greater diversity of moods selected. Four mood characteristics were selected frequently enough to be considered significant. Since this work was structurally a series of variations, the diversity in the selection of moods was understandable. The four mood characteristics most frequently selected were:

7. dramatic, agitated, exciting, triumphant
6. bright, cheerful, gay
8. majestic, martial, vigorous
5. humorous, light, graceful.

Fifty-one percent of the auditors selected music characteristics as a first choice. A continuing emphasis on music characteristics was again evident in terms of second and third choices. 24 music characteristics were selected at least once. A greater clarity of choice was evident as only six music characteristics were selected with enough frequency to be considered significant. They were:

10. lyric melody
18. orderliness of structure
24. ornamentation of melodies
28. wind instrument color
31. dynamic contrast of music
21. interweaving of melodies.

It is interesting to note the emphasis placed on characteristics which could be considered more typical of traditional music. For example, "lyric melody" (10) was selected by 44 auditors as a first, second or third choice. Next came "orderliness of structure" and "ornamentation of melodies." And, while not considered particularly significant, "consonant sounds" (15) was selected by 11 auditors as being an important characteristic.

PRECEDING PAGE MISSING

TABLE 3C-19 (continued)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS (continued)					
Significant Characteristics					
16	3	2	3	8	16
18	2	6	18	26	36
21	3	4	5	12	22
22	2	1	2	5	10
23	1	1	1	3	6
25	2	4	1	7	15
26	1	2	1	4	8
27	-	1	-	1	2
32	-	1	1	2	3
33	-	2	1	3	5
34	1	2	4	7	11
37	1	3	-	4	9
Totals	16	29	87	82	143
Peripheral Characteristics					
13	1	-	-	1	3
14	4	-	2	6	14
24	11	7	7	25	54
36	-	1	-	1	2
Totals	16	8	9	33	73
Characteristics not related					
9	3	1	3	7	14
11	-	1	-	1	2
30	2	-	-	2	6
Totals	5	2	3	10	22
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES					
Mood Characteristics	58	29	22	109	254
% of total	(46.0)	(23.0)	(17.5)	(28.8)	
Music Characteristics	64	79	72	215	422
% of total	(50.8)	(62.7)	(57.1)	(56.9)	
No. of no responses	4	18	32	54	80
% of total	(3.2)	(14.3)	(25.4)	(14.3)	

TABLE 3G-20

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 4 Third Concert
Auditors in Music Training Category I

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	CHOICES				
	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS					
1	-	-	1	1	1
2	1	-	-	1	3
3	-	-	1	1	1
4	1	-	1	2	4
5	1	2	-	3	7
6	5	1	2	8	19
7	3	1	3	7	14
8	3	1	-	4	11
Totals	14	5	8	27	60
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS					
Pervading Characteristics					
10	3	4	1	8	18
12	-	1	1	2	3
15	-	1	1	2	3
28	-	1	1	2	3
31	1	-	-	1	3
Totals	4	7	4	15	30
Significant Characteristics					
16	1	1	-	2	5
18	1	-	2	3	5
21	-	2	-	2	4
25	-	2	-	2	4
32	-	-	1	1	1
34	-	-	1	1	1
37	-	2	-	2	4
Totals	2	7	4	13	24
Peripheral Characteristics					
14	1	-	-	1	3
24	3	2	2	7	15
Totals	4	2	2	8	18

TABLE 3G-20 (continued)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS (continued)					
Characteristics not related					
9	2	-	-	2	6
30	1	-	-	1	3
Totals	3	-	-	3	9
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES					
Mood Characteristics	14	5	8	27	60
% of total	(50.0)	(17.9)	(28.6)	(32.1)	(35.7)
Music Characteristics	13	16	10	39	81
% of total	(46.4)	(57.1)	(35.7)	(46.4)	(48.2)
No. of no responses	1	7	10	18	27
% of total	(3.6)	(25.0)	(35.7)	(21.5)	(16.1)

TABLE 3G-21

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 4 Third Concert
Auditors in Music Training Category II

		CHOICES			
CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS					
1	1	1	-	2	5
3	1	1	-	2	5
4	1	-	2	3	5
5	5	1	1	7	18
6	5	2	1	8	20
7	6	3	-	9	24
8	6	1	2	9	22
Totals	25	9	6	41	99

TABLE 3G-21 (continued)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS					
Pervading Characteristics					
10	3	12	5	20	38
15	1	1	2	4	7
28	4	2	5	11	21
31	-	2	3	5	7
Totals	8	17	15	40	73
Significant Characteristics					
16	-	1	1	2	3
18	1	4	6	11	17
21	1	1	3	5	8
22	-	1	2	3	4
23	1	1	1	3	6
25	1	-	-	1	3
26	1	2	-	3	7
33	-	1	-	1	2
34	1	-	1	2	4
37	1	1	-	2	5
Totals	7	12	14	33	59
Peripheral Characteristics					
24	4	3	2	9	20
Totals	4	3	2	9	20
Characteristics not related					
9	1	1	-	2	5
30	1	-	-	1	3
Totals	2	1	-	3	8
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES					
Mood Characteristics	25	9	6	40	99
% of total	(53.2)	(19.1)	(12.8)	(28.4)	(35.1)
Music Characteristics	21	33	31	85	160
% of total	(44.7)	(70.2)	(66.0)	(60.3)	(56.7)
No. of no responses	1	5	10	16	23
% of total	(2.1)	(10.7)	(21.2)	(11.3)	(8.2)

TABLE 3G-22

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 4 Third Concert
Auditors in Music Training Category III

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	CHOICES First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS					
3	2	-	1	3	7
4	-	2	-	2	4
5	1	-	2	3	5
6	3	2	-	5	13
7	1	2	-	3	7
8	-	2	-	2	4
Totals	7	8	3	18	40
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS					
Pervading Characteristics					
10	4	-	2	6	14
12	-	1	1	2	3
28	2	1	-	3	8
31	1	1	1	3	6
Totals	7	3	4	14	31
Significant Characteristics					
16	-	-	1	1	1
18	-	1	5	6	7
21	1	1	-	2	5
22	1	-	-	1	3
25	-	1	1	2	3
27	-	1	-	1	2
33	-	1	1	2	3
34	-	1	-	1	2
Totals	2	6	8	16	26
Peripheral Characteristics					
13	1	-	-	1	3
14	1	-	-	1	3
24	2	2	1	5	11
Totals	4	2	1	7	17

TABLE 3G-22 (continued)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS (continued)					
Characteristics not related					
NONE					
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES					
Mood Characteristics	7	8	3	18	40
% of total	(35.0)	(40.0)	(15.0)	(30.0)	(33.3)
Music Characteristics	13	11	13	37	74
% of total	(65.0)	(55.0)	(65.0)	(61.7)	(61.7)
No. of no responses	-	1	4	5	6
% of total	(00.0)	(5.0)	(20.0)	(8.3)	(5.0)

TABLE 3G-23

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 4 Third Concert
Auditors in Music Training Category IV

CHARACTERISTIC NO.		CHOICES			
	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS					
2	-	-	1	1	1
3	-	-	1	1	1
4	-	-	1	1	1
5	1	-	-	1	3
6	-	1	-	1	2
7	3	-	2	5	11
8	1	2	-	3	7
Totals	5	3	5	13	26
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS					
Pervading Characteristics					
10	3	2	-	5	13
15	-	2	1	3	5
28	-	1	-	1	2
31	-	1	1	2	3
Totals	3	6	2	11	23

TABLE 3G-23 (continued)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS (continued)					
Significant Characteristics					
16	1	-	-	1	3
18	-	1	1	2	3
21	1	-	-	2	4
25	1	1	-	2	5
32	-	1	-	1	2
34	-	-	2	2	2
Totals	3	3	4	10	19
Peripheral Characteristics					
14	1	-	-	1	3
24	2	-	1	3	7
36	-	1	-	1	2
Totals	3	1	1	5	12
Characteristics not related					
NONE					
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES					
Mood Characteristics	5	3	5	13	26
% of total	(33.3)	(20.0)	(33.3)	(28.9)	(28.9)
Music Characteristics	9	10	7	26	54
% of total	(60.0)	(66.7)	(46.7)	(57.8)	(60.0)
No. of no responses	1	2	3	6	10
% of total	(6.7)	(13.3)	(20.0)	(13.3)	(11.1)

TABLE 3G-24

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 4 Third Concert
Auditors in Music Training Category V

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	CHOICES				
	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS					
1	-	1	-	1	2
4	1	-	-	1	3
5	-	1	-	1	2
6	2	1	-	3	8
7	3	1	-	4	11
8	1	-	-	1	3
Totals	7	4	-	11	29
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS					
Pervading Characteristics					
10	1	3	1	5	10
15	-	2	-	2	4
28	2	-	-	2	6
31	2	2	-	4	10
Totals	5	7	1	13	30
Significant Characteristics					
16	1	-	1	2	4
18	-	-	4	4	4
21	-	-	1	1	1
22	1	-	-	1	3
26	-	-	1	1	1
34	-	1	-	1	2
Totals	2	1	7	10	15
Peripheral Characteristics					
14	1	-	2	3	5
24	-	-	1	1	1
Totals	1	-	3	4	6

TABLE 3G-24 (continued)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
Characteristics not related					
11	-	1	-	1	2
Totals	-	1	-	1	2
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES					
Mood Characteristics	7	4	-	11	29
% of total	(43.8)	(25.0)	(00.0)	(22.9)	(30.2)
Music Characteristics	8	9	11	28	53
% of total	(50.0)	(56.3)	(68.8)	(58.3)	(55.2)
No. of no responses	1	3	5	9	14
% of total	(6.2)	(18.7)	(31.2)	(18.8)	(14.6)

It should be noted that the auditors tended to agree consistently with the styles analysts as to which music characteristics were most significant in each composition. This was true of those with no or limited training, as well as with the auditors who had had a more extensive formal music training.

In comparing the manner in which auditors select mood and music characteristics with their preference responses, it should be noted at this point, that the presence of a parallel between the selection of music characteristics as a first choice and a more favorable preference response to the music exists. While this parallel was not always clearly evident, careful examination of the data showed that the tendency for the two to be related was present.

Fourth Concert

The fourth concert of the Exposition of Contemporary American Music was presented by the College-Conservatory of Music Chorale and Chamber Singers, with Lewis E. Whikehart conducting.

A total of 155 questionnaires were distributed to the audience as they entered the hall. 104 questionnaires were returned at the end of the concert, of which 69 were completely filled out and usable in the study. This constituted a forty-five percent return of usable questionnaires.

Twenty-one compositions were performed by the Chorale and Chamber Singers. They were:

1. Processional: "Let there be Light" (1901)
   Charles E. Ives
   The Chorale

2. Rise up, my love, my fair one(Song of Solomon)
   Healey Willan
3. Monotone of the rain (Carl Sandburg)(1937)
   Normand Lockwood
4. Mary Hynes, Op. 16, No. 1 (James Stephens) (1942)
   Samuel Barber
   The Chamber Singers

5. A fable (Vachel Lindsay)(1946)
   Norman Dello Joio
   The Chorale

Two Madrigals (Jose Garcia Villa) (1960)
Felix Labunski

6. First, the poem must be magical
7. The clock
8. The silent slain(Archibald MacLeish)(1960)
   James Ming
9. Nat Bacon's bones (Archibald MacLeish)(1960)
   James Ming
   The Chamber Singers

10. Laughing Song (William Blake)(1956)
    Earl George
    The Chorale

11. Snow (1949) Kenneth Gaburo
12. The cry (F. J. Lorca) (1953) Kenneth Gaburo

13. Terra tremuit (1957) Kenneth Gaburo
The Chamber Singers

14. The Love of God (Bernard of Rascus)(1958)
Lewis Whikehart

Excerpts from the Mass (1948) Igor Stravinsky
15. Kyrie
16. Agnus Dei
The Chorale

From "Five Statements" (1958-1962)
Wilbur Ogdon
17. A clear midnight (Walt Whitman)
18. Madrigal (Thomas Campion)
19. The last invocation (Walt Whitman)
The Chamber Singers

20. Geographical Fugue (1930) Ernst Toch
21. Psalm 23 (1954) George Rochberg
The Chorale

Analysis of the data in terms of the independent variable, Occupation. Table 4A indicates the distribution of the auditors forming the sample for the Fourth Concert in terms of their Occupation. An examination of the distribution indicated that there were only three groups which were large enough to be of value in the statistical analysis of the data, namely, "musician," "other professionals," and "college students." The other groups were too small to be of any real significance and are included for general information concerning the total make-up of the sample.

Tables 4A-1 through 4A-21 list the preference responses in terms of Occupation for each of the twenty-one compositions performed.

An examination of the F test scores showed that, in terms of Occupation, responses to seven compositions were significantly different. Of the seven one had no real calue from a statistical standpoint. The responses to Composition # 21 (Rochberg - Psalm 23) yielded an F score of 1.109, which was significant at the .500 level. However, an examination of the mean responses of the various groupings indicated that the difference in responses occurred among three groups which were too small to be of any value statistically. (See Table 4A-21.)

In the responses of the other six compositions, which were significantly different, a pattern of difference was clearly evident and uniform for the six works. In each of the six compositions the responses of the occupational group "musicians" were significantly different from those in the "other professionals" and "college students" groups.

The F score for Composition # 1 (Ives - Processional) was 1.221, which was significant at the .500 level. The higher mean response of the "musician" group differed significantly from the mean responses of the other two groups. In this case the mean response was higher. Stylistically the work was dissonant, without a perceptible melody, but with masses or blocks of sound clearly evident. (See Table 4A-1.)

For the remaining five compositions, the mean responses of the "musician" group were significantly lower than the mean responses of the "other professional" and "college student" groups. For the responses to Composition # 7 (Labunski - Clock) the F score was 1.813, which was significant at the .900 level. The F score for Composition # 8 (Ming - Silent Slain) was 1.111, which was significant at the .500 level. The F score for Composition # 9 (Ming - Nat Bacon's bones) was 1.302, also significant at the .500 level. In the case of Composition # 10 (George - Laughing Song), the F score was 2.239, which was significant at the .950 level. And for Composition # 12 (Gaburo - The Cry) the F score was 2.025, significant at the .900 level. (See Tables 4A-7, 4A-8, 4A-9, 4A-10, and 4A-12.)

Compositions # 7 and # 10 stylistically utilized special effects involving a word of the text in a repetitive rhythmic figure, namely "tick-tock" (# 7) and "ha-ha" (# 10). Compositions # 8, # 9 and # 12 also employed repetitive devices which related to the affective mood(s) of each work. The repetitive characteristic emphasizing mood was most obvious in these five works.

TABLE 4A

Occupations of Auditors - Fourth Concert

Occupation	Number
college professor	3
elementary of high school teacher	6
musician	13
other professionals	11
proprietor, manager	5
dealer	1
clerk, office worker	4
college student	26
Total	69

TABLE 4A-1

Preferences Responses in Terms of Occupation
Composition # 1 Fourth Concert

F score - 1.221 - significant at the .500 level

OCCUPATION	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
college professor	0	1	1	1	0	0.0000
elem./h.s.teacher	1	4	1	0	0	1.0000
musician	3	4	2	4	0	0.4615
other professionals	1	3	2	5	0	0.0000
dealer	0	0	0	0	1	-2.0000
clerk, office worker	0	1	0	1	2	-1 0000
proprietor, manager	0	1	1	2	1	-0.6000
college student	3	8	6	3	6	-0.0385

TABLE 4A-2

Preference Responses in Terms of Occupation
Composition # 2 Fourth Concert

F score - .412 - not significant

OCCUPATION	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
college professor	0	3	0	0	0	1.0000
elem/h.s. teacher	3	2	1	1	0	1.1667
musician	6	6	0	0	1	1.2308
other professionals	5	5	0	1	0	1.2727
proprietor, manager	3	2	0	0	0	1.6000
dealer	1	0	0	0	0	2.0000
clerk, office worker	3	1	0	0	0	1.7500
college student	16	9	1	0	0	1.5769

TABLE 4A-3

Preference Responses in Terms of Occupation
Composition # 3 Fourth Concert

F score - .325 - not significant

OCCUPATION	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
college professor	1	1	1	0	0	1.0000
elem/h.s. teacher	2	3	0	1	0	1.0000
musician	5	6	1	0	1	1.0769
other professionals	5	5	1	0	0	1.3636
proprietor, manager	2	3	0	0	0	1.4000
dealer	1	0	0	0	0	2.0000
clerk, office worker	2	2	0	0	0	1.5000
college student	15	10	1	0	0	1.5385

TABLE 4A-4

Preference Responses in Terms of Occupation
Composition # 4 Fourth Concert

F score - .264 - not significant

OCCUPATION	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
college professor	0	2	0	1	0	0.3333
elem/h.s. teacher	2	4	0	0	0	1.3333
musician	6	5	1	1	0	1.2308
other professionals	5	3	2	1	0	1.0909

TABLE 4A-4 (continued)

OCCUPATION	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
proprietor, manager	3	0	2	0	0	1.2000
dealer	1	0	0	0	0	2.0000
clerk, office worker	2	1	1	0	0	1.2500
college student	12	12	1	1	0	1.3463

TABLE 4A-5

Preference Responses in Terms of Occupation
Composition # 5 Fourth Concert

F score - .431 - not significant

OCCUPATION	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
college professor	1	0	1	1	0	0.3333
elem./h.s. teacher	3	2	0	0	1	1.0000
musician	6	6	0	0	1	1.2308
other professionals	3	6	2	0	0	1.0909
proprietor, manager	2	2	1	0	0	1.2000
dealer	0	1	0	0	0	1.0000
clerk, office worker	0	3	1	0	0	0.7500
college student	13	12	1	0	0	1.4615

TABLE 4A-6

Preference Responses in Terms of Occupation
Composition # 6 Fourth Concert

F score - .639 - not significant

OCCUPATION	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
college professor	1	0	0	1	1	-0.3333
elem/h.s. teacher	1	3	2	0	0	0.8333
musician	1	7	4	1	0	0.6154
other professionals	2	8	0	1	0	1.0000
proprietor, manager	0	3	1	1	0	0.4000
dealer	0	0	1	0	0	0.0000
clerk, office worker	1	1	2	0	0	0.7500
college student	3	19	3	1	0	0.9231

TABLE 4A-7

Preference Responses in Terms of Occupation
Composition # 7 Fourth Concert

F score - 1.813 - significant at the .900 level

OCCUPATION	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
college professor	0	0	0	1	2	-1.6667
elem./h.s. teacher	5	0	0	1	0	1.5000
musician	5	4	2	1	1	0.8462
other professionals	6	3	1	1	0	1.2727
proprietor, manager	1	2	1	1	0	0.6000
dealer	1	0	0	0	0	2.0000
clerk, office worker	1	3	0	0	0	1.2500
college student	12	9	4	1	0	1.2308

TABLE 4A-8

Preference Responses in Terms of Occupation
Composition # 8 Fourth Concert

F score - 1.111 - significant at the .500 level

OCCUPATION	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
college professor	1	0	1	1	0	0.3333
elem/h.s. teacher	1	4	1	0	0	1.0000
musician	3	2	4	5	0	0.2308
other professionals	1	7	3	0	0	0.8182
proprietor, manager	0	2	3	0	0	0.4000
dealer	0	0	1	0	0	0.0000
clerk, office worker	0	0	2	2	0	-0.5000
college student	5	14	7	0	0	0.9231

TABLE 4A-9

Preference Responses in Terms of Occupation
Composition # 9 Fourth Concert

F score - 1.302 - significant at the .500 level

OCCUPATION	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
college professor	0	0	0	2	1	-1.3333
elem/h.s. teacher	1	1	2	1	1	0.0000
musician	4	2	3	3	1	0.3846
other professionals	2	6	3	0	0	0.9091

TABLE 4A-9 (continued)

OCCUPATION	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
proprietor, manager	1	1	2	1	0	0.4000
dealer	0	1	0	0	0	1.0000
clerk, office worker	0	1	1	2	0	-0.2500
college student	8	11	5	2	0	0.9615

TABLE 4A-10

Preference Responses in Terms of Occupation
Composition # 10 Fourth Concert

F score - 2.239 - significant at the .950 level

OCCUPATION	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
college professor	0	1	1	0	1	-0.3333
elem./h.s. teacher	2	2	1	1	0	0.8333
musician	6	2	4	1	0	1.0000
other professionals	7	3	1	0	0	1.5455
proprietor, manager	0	2	1	2	0	0.0000
dealer	0	0	1	0	0	0.0000
clerk, office worker	1	1	0	1	1	0.0000
college student	15	11	0	0	0	1.5769

TABLE 4A-11

Preference Responses in Terms of Occupation
Composition # 11 Fourth Concert

F score - .890 - not significant

OCCUPATION	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
college professor	1	0	1	1	0	0.3333
elem./h.s. teacher	1	4	1	0	0	1.0000
musician	1	7	4	1	0	0.6154
other professionals	2	8	1	0	0	1.0909
proprietor, manager	0	2	2	1	0	0.2000
dealer	0	0	0	0	1	-2.0000
clerk, office worker	0	4	0	0	0	1.0000
college student	11	6	5	3	1	0.8846

TABLE 4A-12

Preference Responses in Terms of Occupation
Composition # 12 Fourth Concert

F score - 2.025 - significant at the .900 level

OCCUPATION	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
college professor	1	0	0	0	2	-0.6667
elem/h.s. teacher	0	3	2	1	0	0.3333
musician	2	1	3	7	0	-0.1538
other professionals	1	4	4	2	0	0.3636
proprietor, manager	0	1	3	0	1	-0.2000
dealer	0	0	1	0	0	0.0000
clerk, office worker	0	2	2	0	0	0.5000
college student	2	11	10	3	0	0.4615

TABLE 4A-13

Preference Responses in Terms of Occupation
Composition # 13 Fourth Concert

F score - .569 - not significant

OCCUPATION	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
college professor	1	0	0	0	2	-0.6667
elem.h.s. teacher	1	2	3	0	0	0.6667
musician	4	1	3	3	2	0.1538
other professionals	0	3	3	4	1	-0.2727
proprietor, manager	0	1	0	3	1	-0.8000
dealer	0	0	0	0	1	-2.0000
clerk, office worker	0	1	2	1	0	0.0000
college student	4	8	6	5	3	0.1928

TABLE 4A-14

Preference Responses in Terms of Occupation
Composition # 14 Fourth Concert

F score - .325 - not significant

OCCUPATION	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
college professor	2	0	1	0	0	1.3333
elem/h.s. teacher	5	1	0	0	0	1.8333
musician	8	4	0	1	0	1.4615
other professionals	9	2	0	0	0	1.8182

TABLE 4A-14 (continued)

OCCUPATION	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
proprietor, manager	3	2	0	0	0	1.6000
dealer	1	0	0	0	0	2.0000
clerk, office worker	3	0	1	0	0	1.5000
college student	21	4	1	0	0	1.7692

TABLE 4A-15

Preference Responses in Terms of Occupation
Composition # 15 Fourth Concert

_F_ score - .533 - not significant

OCCUPATION	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
college professor	2	0	0	0	1	0.6667
elem/h.s. teacher	0	3	3	0	0	0.5000
musician	5	3	3	2	0	0.8462
other professionals	0	7	3	1	0	0.5455
proprietor, manager	0	1	2	1	1	-0.4000
dealer	0	0	0	1	0	-1.0000
clerk, office worker	0	2	2	0	0	0.5000
college student	5	8	9	4	0	0.5385

TABLE 4A-16

Preference Responses in Terms of Occupation
Composition # 16 Fourth Concert

_F_ score - .617 - not significant

OCCUPATION	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
college professor	1	1	0	0	1	0.3333
elem/h.s. teacher	1	3	2	0	0	0.8333
musician	2	7	2	2	0	0.6923
other professionals	0	7	3	1	0	0.5455
proprietor, manager	0	1	2	1	1	-0.4000
dealer	0	0	0	1	0	-1.0000
clerk, office worker	0	1	2	1	0	0.0000
college student	4	9	9	4	0	0.5000

TABLE 4A-17

Preference Responses in Terms of Occupation
Composition # 17 Fourth Concert

F score - .349 - not significant

OCCUPATION	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
college professor	2	0	0	0	1	0.6667
elem./h.s. teacher	1	3	1	1	0	0.6667
musician	3	2	4	4	0	0.3077
other professionals	0	4	6	1	0	0.2727
proprietor, manager	0	2	1	0	2	-0.4000
dealer	0	0	1	0	0	0.0000
clerk, office worker	0	1	1	1	1	-0.5000
college student	3	10	8	4	1	0.3846

TABLE 4A-18

Preference Responses in Terms of Occupation
Composition # 18 Fourth Concert

F score - .722 - not significant

OCCUPATION	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
college professor	1	1	0	0	1	0.3333
elem/h.s. teacher	2	1	1	2	0	0.5000
musician	2	6	3	2	0	0.6154
other professionals	0	3	7	1	0	0.1818
proprietor, manager	0	1	1	2	1	-0.6000
dealer	1	0	0	0	0	2.0000
clerk, office worker	0	1	2	1	0	0.0000
college student	1	9	14	2	0	0.3462

TABLE 4A-19

Preference Responses in Terms of Occupation
Composition # 19 Fourth Concert

F score - .527 - not significant

OCCUPATION	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
college professor	2	0	0	0	1	0.6667
elem/h.s. teacher	3	1	1	1	0	1.0000
musician	5	5	1	2	0	1.0000
other professionals	2	4	4	1	0	0.8182

TABLE 4A-19 (continued)

OCCUPATION	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
proprietor, manager	0	1	1	2	1	-0.6000
dealer	0	1	0	0	0	1.0000
clerk, office worker	1	2	1	0	0	1.0000
college student	8	8	5	4	1	0.6923

TABLE 4A-20

Preference Responses in Terms of Occupation
Composition # 20 Fourth Concert

F score - .194 - not significant

OCCUPATION	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
college professor	1	1	0	0	1	0.3333
elem/h.s. teacher	3	1	2	0	0	1.1667
musician	8	4	1	0	0	1.5385
other professionals	7	1	1	2	0	1.1818
proprietor, manager	3	1	0	1	0	1.2000
dealer	1	0	0	0	0	2.0000
clerk, office worker	3	0	0	0	1	1.0000
college student	14	8	2	0	2	1.2308

TABLE 4A-21

Preference Responses in Terms of Occupation
Composition # 21 Fourth Concert

F score - 1.109 - significant at the .500 level

OCCUPATION	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
college professor	1	0	1	1	0	0.3333
elem/h.s. teacher	2	3	0	1	0	1.0000
musician	7	5	1	0	0	1.4615
other professionals	6	2	3	0	0	1.2727
proprietor, manager	0	2	1	1	1	-0.2000
dealer	0	0	0	1	0	-1.0000
clerk, office worker	1	2	1	0	0	1.0000
college student	12	9	3	1	1	1.1538

Analysis of the data in terms of the independent variable, Age Level. Table 4B indicates the distribution of the auditors forming the sample for the Fourth Concert in terms of their Age Level. An examination of the distribution showed three age groups in which the number of auditors was too small to be of any real value in the statistical analysis of the data, namely, "46 - 55," "56 - 65," and "66 orover." Therefore any significant differences were considered only in terms of the four younger age groups. The data for the other three groups was included for general information.

Tables 2B-1 through 2B-21 list the preference responses in terms of Age Level for the twenty-one compositions performed.

An examination of the F scores revealed that the responses to eleven compositions, in terms of Age Level, differed with varying levels of significance. In nine of the compositions the lowest mean response was obtained from the auditors forming the "26-35" age group. In each of the nine cases the low mean response of those in the "26 - 35" age group differed significantly from the responses of the other three groups being considered. In seven of the nine Compositions the mean responses of the "21 or under," "22 - 25" and "36 - 45" age levels tended to be grouped together. In two of the compositions the grouping of the mean responses of the three age groups was not evident.

The responses to Composition # 3 (Lockwood - Monotone) yielded an F score of 2.066, which was significant at the .900 level. The "26 - 35" age group had the lowest mean response, primarily because of one "-2" response and three "0" responses within the group. (See Table 4B-3.)

The F score for Composition # 10 (George - Laughing Song) was 3.563, which was significant at the .995 level. Again the low mean response of the "26 - 35" age group was primarily due to three "-1" responses and seven "0" responses. (See Table 4B-10.) This pattern was evident also in those compositions where the significant difference was not as great. Thus, in those nine compositions where the responses of the "26 - 35" age group were significantly lower, it was due to a greater number of "no opinion" and negative responses to the composition.

The remaining seven compositions included Composition # 5 (Dello Joio - A Fable) with an F score of 1.539, significant at the .750 level (see Table 4B-5); Composition # 7 (Labunski - The Clock), with an F score of 1.589, significant at the .750 level (see Table 4B-7); Composition # 9 (King - Nat Bacon's bones) with an F score of 1.275, significant at the .500 level (see Table 4B-9); Composition # 12 (Gaburo - The Cry) with an F score of .894, significant at the .500 level (see Table 4B-12); Composition # 14 (Whikehart - Love of God) with an F score of 1.240, significant at the .500 level (see Table 4B-14); and Compositions # 15 and # 16, the two excerpts from the Stravinsky Compositions #15 and # 16, the two excerpts from the Stravinsky Mass, with F scores of 1.000 and 1.085 respectively, both significant at the .500 level. (See Tables 4B-15 and 4B-16.)

While differences in responses which are significant at the .500 level must be viewed with caution, they do have a greater implied significance if they tend to fit into a pattern which is also supported by differences in responses which are significant at higher statistical levels. Thus, the conclusion could be drawn that the "26 - 35" age group did tend to respond less favorably than did the other three age groups with which they were compared. Stylistically the nine compositions were not similar.

The F score for Composition # 1 (Ives - Processional) was 1.287, which was significant at the .500 level. The negative mean response of the "21 or under" age group differed significantly from the "22 - 25" age group. For the responses to Composition # 19 (Ogdon - Last Invocation) the F score was 1.105, which was significant at the .500 level. Here the high mean response of the "22 - 25" age group differed significantly from the low mean response of the "36 - 45" age group. Since the level of significance was low and the differences in mean responses did not fit into a pattern which was found in the responses to other compositions, the differences were determined to be of doubtful significance.

TABLE 4B

Age Levels of Auditors - Fourth Concert

Age Level	Number
21 or under	17
22 - 25	19
26 - 35	16
36 - 45	12
46 - 55	1
56 - 65	3
66 or over	1
Totals	69

TABLE 4B-1

Preference Responses in Terms of Age
Composition # 1 Fourth Concert

F score - 1.287 - significant at the .500 level

AGE GROUP	+2	+1	0	-1	-3	Mean
21 or under	0	6	4	2	5	-0.3529
22 - 25	4	7	3	3	2	0.4211
26 - 35	3	2	4	6	1	0.0000
36 - 45	1	5	0	4	2	-0.0833
46 - 55	0	1	0	0	0	1.0000
56 - 65	0	1	2	0	0	0.3333
66 or over	0	0	0	1	0	-1.0000

TABLE 4B-2

Preference Responses in Terms of Age
Composition # 2 Fourth Concert

F score - .738 - not significant

AGE GROUP	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
21 or under	12	5	0	0	0	1.7059
22 - 25	7	9	2	1	0	1.1579
26 - 35	9	6	0	0	1	1.3750
36 - 45	7	4	0	1	0	1.4167
46 - 55	0	1	0	0	0	1.0000
56 - 65	1	2	0	0	0	1.3333
66 or over	1	0	0	0	0	2.0000

TABLE 4B-3

Preference Responses in Terms of Age
Composition # 3 Fourth Concert

F score - 2.066 - significant at the .900 level

AGE GROUP	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
21 or under	12	5	0	0	0	1.7059
22 - 25	8	9	1	1	0	1.2632
26 - 35	5	7	3	0	1	0.9375
36 - 45	4	8	0	0	0	1.3333
46 - 55	0	1	0	0	0	1.0000
56 - 65	3	0	0	0	0	2.0000
66 or over	1	0	0	0	0	2.0000

TABLE 4B-4

Preference Responses in Terms of Age
Composition # 4 Fourth Concert

F score - .645 - not significant

AGE GROUP	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
21 or under	7	8	1	1	0	1.2353
22 - 25	8	9	2	0	0	1.3158
26 - 35	7	3	3	3	0	0.8750
36 - 45	6	5	1	0	0	1.4167
46 - 55	1	0	0	0	0	2.0000
56 - 65	1	2	0	0	0	1.3333
66 or over	1	0	0	0	0	2.0000

TABLE 4B-5

Preference Responses in Terms of Age
Composition # 5 Fourth Concert

F score - 1.539 - significant at the .750 level

AGE GROUP	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
21 or under	7	10	0	0	0	1.4118
22 - 25	10	5	3	0	1	1.2105
26 - 35	3	8	3	1	1	0.6875
36 - 45	6	6	0	0	0	1.5000
46 - 55	1	0	0	0	0	2.0000
56 - 65	1	2	0	0	0	1.3333
66 or over	0	1	0	0	0	1.0000

TABLE 4B-6

Preference Responses in Terms of Age
Composition # 6 Fourth Concert

F score - .681 - not significant

AGE GROUP	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
21 or under	1	13	2	1	0	0.8235
22 - 25	4	11	3	1	0	0.9474
26 - 35	4	5	4	3	0	0.6250
36 - 45	0	8	4	0	0	0.6667
46 - 55	0	1	0	0	0	1.0000
56 - 65	0	2	0	0	1	0.0000
66 or over	0	1	0	0	0	1.0000

TABLE 4B-7

Preference Responses in Terms of Age
Composition # 7 Fourth Concert

F score - 1.589 - significant at the .750 level

AGE GROUP	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
21 or under	7	7	2	1	0	1.1765
22 - 25	8	8	2	1	0	1.2105
26 - 35	6	1	3	4	2	0.3125
36 - 45	7	4	1	0	0	1.5000
46 - 55	0	1	0	0	0	1.0000
56 - 65	2	0	0	0	1	0.6667
66 or over	1	0	0	0	0	2.0000

TABLE 4B-8

Preference Responses in Terms of Age
Composition # 8 Fourth Concert

F score - .733 - not significant

AGE GROUP	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
21 or under	3	10	4	0	0	0.9412
22 - 25	3	9	5	2	0	0.6842
26 - 35	3	4	5	4	0	0.3750
36 - 45	1	4	6	1	0	0.4167
46 - 55	0	1	0	0	0	1.0000
56 - 65	1	0	1	1	0	0.3333
66 or over	0	1	0	0	0	1.0000

TABLE 4B-9

Preference Responses in Terms of Age
Composition # 9 Fourth Concert

F score - 1.275 - significant at the .500 level

AGE GROUP	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
21 or under	5	7	4	1	0	0.9412
22 - 25	6	7	1	4	1	0.6842
26 - 35	2	6	2	5	1	0.1875
36 - 45	1	3	8	0	0	0.4167
46 - 55	1	0	0	0	0	2.0000
56 - 65	1	0	0	1	1	-0.3333
66 or over	0	0	1	0	0	0.0000

TABLE 4B-10

Preference Responses in Terms of Age
Composition # 10 Fourth Concert

F score - 3.563 - significant at the .995 level

AGE GROUP	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
21 or under	10	7	0	0	0	1.5882
22 - 25	10	7	1	0	1	1.3159
26 - 35	3	3	7	3	0	0.3750
36 - 45	6	4	1	1	0	1.2500
46 - 55	0	1	0	0	0	1.0000
56 - 65	1	0	0	1	1	-0.3333

TABLE 4B-11

Preference Responses in Terms of Age
Composition # 11 Fourth Concert

F score - .501 - not significant

AGE GROUP	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
21 or under	6	4	3	3	1	0.6471
22 - 25	5	11	3	0	0	1.1053
26 - 35	3	7	3	2	1	0.5625
36 - 45	1	6	5	0	0	0.6667
46 - 55	0	1	0	0	0	1.0000
56 - 65	1	1	0	1	0	0.6667
66 or over	0	1	0	0	0	1.0000

TABLE 4B-12

Preference Responses in Terms of Age
Composition # 12 Fourth Concert

F score - .894 - significant at the .500 level

AGE GROUP	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
21 or under	1	6	8	2	0	0.3529
22 - 25	1	9	5	4	0	0.3684
26 - 35	1	3	5	5	2	-0.2500
36 - 45	2	3	5	2	0	0.4167
46 - 55	0	1	0	0	0	1.0000
56 - 65	1	0	1	0	1	0.0000
66 or over	0	0	1	0	0	0.0000

TABLE 4B-13

Preference Responses in Terms of Age
Composition # 13 Fourth Concert

F score - .563 - not significant

AGE GROUP	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
21 or under	2	5	4	3	3	0.0000
22 - 25	4	5	5	4	1	0.3684
26 - 35	3	1	5	4	3	-0.1875
36 - 45	0	4	2	4	2	-0.3333
46 - 55	0	1	0	0	0	1.0000
56 - 65	1	0	0	1	1	-0.3333
66 or over	0	0	1	0	0	0.0000

TABLE 4B-14

Preference Responses in Terms of Age
Composition # 14 Fourth Concert

F score - 1.240 - significant at the .500 level

AGE GROUP	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
21 or under	15	1	1	0	0	1.8235
22 - 25	12	6	1	0	0	1.5789
26 - 35	10	4	1	1	0	1.4375
36 - 45	11	1	0	0	0	1.9167
46 - 55	0	1	0	0	0	1.0000
56 - 65	3	0	0	0	0	2.0000
66 or over	1	0	0	0	0	2.0000

TABLE 4B-15

Preference Responses in Terms of Age
Composition # 15 Fourth Concert

F score - 1.000 - significant at the .500 level

AGE GROUP	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
21 or under	2	5	7	3	0	0.3529
22 - 25	5	9	4	1	0	0.9474
26 - 35	3	3	5	4	1	0.1875
36 - 45	1	4	6	1	0	0.4167
46 - 55	0	1	0	0	0	1.0000
56 - 65	1	1	0	0	1	0.3333
66 or over	0	1	0	0	0	1.0000

TABLE 4B-16

Preference Responses in Terms of Age
Composition # 16 Fourth Concert

F score - 1.085 - significant at the .500 level

AGE GROUP	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
21 or under	3	5	6	3	0	0.4706
22 - 25	2	11	5	1	0	0.7368
26 - 35	2	4	3	6	1	0.0000
36 - 45	1	5	6	0	0	0.5833
46 - 55	0	1	0	0	0	1.0000
56 - 65	0	2	0	0	1	0.0000
66 or over	0	1	0	0	0	1.0000

TABLE 4B-17

Preference Responses in Terms of Age
Composition # 17 Fourth Concert

F score - .668 - not significant

AGE GROUP	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
21 or under	1	7	5	3	1	0.2353
22 - 25	3	6	6	3	1	0.3684
26 - 35	3	3	6	2	2	0.1875
36 - 45	0	5	3	3	1	0.0000
46 - 55	0	1	0	0	0	1.0000
56 - 65	2	0	1	0	0	1.3333
66 or over	0	0	1	0	0	0.0000

TABLE 4B-18

Preference Responses in Terms of Age
Composition # 18   Fourth Concert

F score - .350 - not significant

AGE GROUP	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
21 or under	0	6	10	1	0	0.2941
22 - 25	2	6	6	5	0	0.2632
26 - 35	2	5	5	3	1	0.2500
36 - 45	2	3	5	1	1	0.3333
46 - 55	0	1	0	0	0	1.0000
56 - 65	1	1	1	0	0	1.0000
66 or over	0	0	1	0	0	0.0000

TABLE 4B-19

Preference Responses in Terms of Age
Composition # 19   Fourth Concert

F score - 1.105 - significant at the .500 level

AGE GROUP	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
21 or under	2	7	5	3	0	0.4706
22 - 25	10	5	1	2	1	1.1053
26 - 35	5	6	3	0	2	0.7500
36 - 45	2	3	2	5	0	0.1667
46 - 55	0	1	0	0	0	1.0000
56 - 65	2	0	1	0	0	1.3333
66 or over	0	0	1	0	0	0.0000

TABLE 4B-20

Preference Responses in Terms of Age
Composition # 20   Fourth Concert

F score - .475 - not significant

AGE GROUP	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
21 or under	8	6	2	0	1	1.1765
22 - 25	12	4	0	1	2	1.2105
26 - 35	8	5	1	1	1	1.1250
36 - 45	8	1	w	1	0	1.2500
46 - 55	1	0	0	0	0	2.0000
56 - 65	3	0	0	0	0	2.0000
66 or over	0	0	1	0	0	0.0000

TABLE 4B-21

Preference Responses in Terms of Age
Composition # 21   Fourth Concert

F score - .566 - not significant

AGE GROUP	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
21 or under	7	5	3	1	1	0.9412
22 - 25	7	8	4	0	0	1.1579
26 - 35	8	4	1	2	1	1.0000
36 - 45	7	3	1	1	0	1.2500
46 - 55	0	1	0	0	0	1.0000
56 - 65	0	1	1	1	0	0.0000
66 or over	0	1	0	0	0	1.0000

Analysis of the data in terms of the independent variable, Music Training. Table 4C indicates the distribution of the auditors forming the sample for the Fourth Concert in terms of their formal music training. The distribution of the auditors among the five categories was such that all categories were large enough to be of value in the statistical analysis of the data.

Tables 4C-1 through 4C-21 list the preference responses in terms of formal music training for each of the 21 compositions performed.

As was indicated in the analysis of the data for the first three concerts, there again occurred a general pattern to the responses for most of the compositions in the Fourth Concert. The pattern generally found the lowest mean response coming from Category I auditors with the mean responses being successively higher for Categories II, III and IV. The highest mean response generally came from the Category IV group. The mean response of Category V auditors was somewhat lower than that of Category IV. However, there were deviations from the general pattern in the responses to some of the compositions performed at the Fourth Concert. Those which follow the pattern will be discussed first.

The responses to twelve compositions yielded F scores which were of significance. With two exceptions they were significant at the .500 level, the lowest level of significance. This was due in part to the relatively small size of the sample (in comparison to the samples for the other concerts) and also because many of the compositions were received very favorably, with very few negative responses. When the distribution of responses was generally skewed towards "+2" the F test was not as effective as when there was a distribution of the responses over all five degrees of the preference scale.

The F score for Composition # 3 (Lockwood - Monotone) was 1.230, significant at the .500 level. The mean responses of the five categories followed the pattern outlined before, with the difference between the low and high mean responses being large enough to be significant. (See Table 4C-3.)

The responses to Composition # 4 (Barber - Mary Hynes) yielded an F score of 1.000, also significant at the .500 level. Again the pattern previously outlined was evident with the difference between the low and high mean responses being of significance. (See Table 4C-4.)

For Composition # 5 (Dello Joio - A Fable), the F score was .941, again significant at the .500 level. In this case the mean responses for Categories I and II were vitrually the same. Otherwise the pattern of the curve of mean responses was obvious, with the difference between the low and high means being significant.

For Composition # 7 (Labunski - The Clock), the pattern was again similar, with one important difference. The F score was 1.142, significant at the .500 level. The mean responses for Categories I and II were virtually the same. The mean responses for Categories III and IV were higher with the apex at Category IV. However, the lowest mean response came from the group forming Category V, this being the basis for the significant difference. The specialized use of the rhythmic and textual effect of "tick-tock"probably accounted for the low mean response by Category V. (See Table 4C-7.) Although it was not significant statistically, a similar pattern was evident in Composition # 10 (George - Laughing Song) where a similar effect using "ha-ha" was employed. (See Table 4C-10.)

For six of the compositions the pattern of mean responses was distorted somewhat. In the responses to each of the six works there was an unusually high ratio of "0" or "no opinion" responses, in most cases amounting to about one-third of the total number of responses. When this occurred there was deviation from the general pattern.

It is evident in the responses to Composition # 8 (Ming - Silent Slain) which yielded an F soore of 2.252, significant at the .950 level. Here the highest mean response came from the Category II grouping and the lowest mean response from those in Category IV (over half of those in Category IV gave a "0" response). (See Table 4C-8.) Hence the significant difference was more the result of indecision.

Thirty-seven percent of the auditors gave a "0" or "no opinion" response to Composition # 12 (Gaburo - The Cry). As a result the mean responses of the first four categories were very close, all positive, while the negative mean response of those in Category V provided the basis for the significant difference. The F score was 1.496, significant at the .750 level. (See Table 4C-12.)

For Composition # 13 (Gaburo - Terra tremuit) the number of "no opinion" responses were also relatively high. The effect here was to obtain positive mean responses from Categories I and III, and negative mean responses from Categories II, IV and V. Categories I and III had the highest percentage of "no opinion" responses. The F score was .903, significant at the .500 level. (See Table 4C-13.)

A high percentage of "no opinion" responses also affected the pattern of mean responses for Composition # 15 (Stravinsky - Kyrie). The F score was 1.050, significant at the .500 level. All categories except Category V had a high proportion of "no opinion" responses.

Responses to Compositions # 17 and # 18, A Clear Midnight and Madrigal by Ogdon, showed less distortion of the pattern of mean responses. The F scores were 1.188 and 1.033 respectively, both significant at the .500 level. Both received high ratios of "no opinion" responses (22 and 28 respectively). For both compositions the highest mean response came from Category III auditors. The higher ratio of "no opinion" responses from those in Categories II and IV for both works affested the mean response patterns, more so for Composition # 17 than for Composition # 18. (See Tables 4C-17 and 4C-18.)

The F score for Composition # 1 (Ives - Processional) was 1.037, significant at the .500 level. Here a completely different pattern occurred. The high mean response was from Category I auditors. The mean responses of Categories III and V were very close, grouped about midway between the high response of Category I and the low negative responses from Categories II and IV. The stylistic characteristics of this composition, namely, dissonance, masses or blocks of sound, and no perceptible melody suggested that comprehension of the musical style had an affect on the pattern of responses. Also the short duration of the work, approximately one and one-half minutes, along with the fact that it was the first composition performed, probably contributed to the distortion of the pattern of mean responses. (See Table 4C-1.)

One other composition elicited responses that were significantly different. Composition # 14 (Whikehart - Love of God). The F score was 1.920, significant at the .750 level. The highest mean response came from those forming Category II. Here the very high ratio of "+2" responses (52 - seventy-five percent) resulted in a skewing of the curve towards "+2", reducing the usefulness of the F test and changing the pattern of mean responses somewhat. It does suggest that this traditional sounding work, written by the conductor of the evening, Whikehart, elicited responses which were not totally related to the musical content of the composition.

TABLE 4C

Music Training of Auditors - Fourth Concert

MUSIC TRAINING CATEGORY	Number
I	12
II	20
III	12
IV	8
V	17
Total	69

TABLE 4C-1

Preference Responses in Terms of Music Training
Composition # 1 Fourth Concert

F score - 1.037 - significant at the .500 level

MUSIC TRAINING CATEGORY	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
I	3	4	3	0	2	0.5000
II	0	6	3	9	2	-0.3500
III	2	4	2	2	2	0.1667
IV	0	3	2	1	2	-0.2500
V	3	5	3	4	2	0.1765

TABLE 4C-2

Preference Responses in Terms of Music Training
Composition # 2 Fourth Concert

F score - .363 - not significant

MUSIC TRAINING CATEGORY	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
I	2	10	0	0	0	1.1667
II	13	5	0	2	0	1.4500
III	8	3	1	0	0	1.5833
IV	5	2	1	0	0	1.5000
V	9	7	0	0	1	1.3529

TABLE 4C-3

Preference Responses in Terms of Music Training
Composition # 3 Fourth Concert

F score - 1.230 - significant at the .500 level

MUSIC TRAINING CATEGORY	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
I	2	10	0	0	0	1.1667
II	7	11	1	1	0	1.2000
III	8	3	1	0	0	1.5833
IV	6	2	0	0	0	1.7500
V	10	4	2	0	1	1.2941

TABLE 4C-4

Preference Responses in Terms of Music Training
Composition # 4 Fourth Concert

F score - 1.000 - significant at the .500 level

MUSIC TRAINING CATEGORY	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
I	4	5	3	0	0	1.0833
II	8	8	3	1	0	1.1500
III	5	5	1	1	0	1.1667
IV	6	2	0	0	0	1.7500
V	8	7	0	2	0	1.2353

TABLE 4C-5

Preference Responses in Terms of Music Training
Composition # 5 Fourth Concert

F score - .941 - significant at the .500 level

MUSIC TRAINING CATEGORY	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
I	4	5	3	0	0	1.0833
II	4	10	2	1	1	0.9500
III	5	7	0	0	0	1.4167
IV	4	4	0	0	0	1.5000
V	9	6	1	0	1	1.2941

TABLE 4C-6

Preference Responses in Terms of Music Training
Composition # 6 Fourth Concert

F score - .382 - not significant

MUSIC TRAINING CATEGORY	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
I	2	7	2	1	0	0.8333
II	3	13	2	2	0	0.8500
III	1	8	3	0	0	0.8333
IV	1	4	3	0	0	0.7500
V	2	9	3	2	1	0.5294

TABLE 4C-7

Preference Responses in Terms of Music Training
Composition # 7 Fourth Concert

F score - 1.142 - significant at the .500 level

MUSIC TRAINING CATEGORY	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
I	5	5	1	1	0	1.1667
II	10	6	1	2	1	1.1000
III	6	4	1	1	0	1.2500
IV	5	2	0	1	0	1.3750
V	5	4	5	1	2	0.5294

TABLE 4C-8

Preference Responses in Terms of Music Training
Composition # 8 Fourth Concert

F score - 2.252 - significant at the .950 level

MUSIC TRAINING CATEGORY	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
I	2	6	3	1	0	0.7500
II	4	10	6	0	0	0.9000
III	2	6	3	1	0	0.7500
IV	0	1	5	2	0	-0.1250
V	3	6	4	4	0	0.4706

TABLE 4C-9

Preference Responses in Terms of Music Training
Composition # 9 Fourth Concert

F score - .218 - not significant

MUSIC TRAINING CATEGORY	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
I	1	6	2	3	0	0.4167
II	5	4	9	1	1	0.5500
III	3	6	0	3	0	0.7500
IV	3	1	3	1	0	0.7500
V	4	6	2	3	2	0.4118

TABLE 4C-10

Preference Responses in Terms of Music Training
Composition # 10 Fourth Concert

F score - .421 - not significant

MUSIC TRAINING CATEGORY	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
I	5	5	1	0	1	1.0833
II	9	8	1	2	0	1.2000
III	5	3	3	1	0	1.0000
IV	4	3	1	0	0	1.3750
V	8	3	3	2	1	0.8824

TABLE 4C-11

Preference Responses in Terms of Music Training
Composition # 11 Fourth Concert

F score - .501 - not significant

MUSIC TRAINING CATEGORY	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
I	1	9	2	0	0	0.9167
II	7	7	4	2	0	1.0000
III	4	3	3	1	1	0.6667
IV	1	4	1	1	1	0.3750
V	3	8	4	2	0	0.7059

TABLE 4C-12

Preference Responses in Terms of Music Training
Composition # 12 Fourth Concert

F score - 1.496 - significant at the .750 level

MUSIC TRAINING CATEGORY	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
I	0	5	6	1	0	0.3333
II	2	8	7	2	1	0.4000
III	2	3	5	2	0	0.4167
IV	1	3	2	2	0	0.3750
V	1	3	5	6	2	-0.2941

TABLE 4C-13

Preference Responses in Terms of Music Training
Composition # 13 Fourth Concert

F score - .903 - not significant

MUSIC TRAINING CATEGORY	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
I	0	6	4	2	0	0.3333
II	3	4	5	5	3	-0.0500
III	2	4	4	1	1	0.4167
IV	2	0	1	3	2	-0.3750
V	3	2	3	5	4	-0.2941

TABLE 4C-14

Preference Responses in Terms of Music Training
Composition # 14 Fourth Concert

F score - 1.920 - significant at the .750 level

MUSIC TRAINING CATEGORY	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
I	4	7	1	0	0	1.2500
II	19	1	0	0	0	1.9500
III	10	1	1	0	0	1.7500
IV	6	2	0	0	0	1.7500
V	13	2	1	1	0	1.5882

TABLE 4C-15

Preference Responses in Terms of Music Training
Composition # 15 Fourth Concert

F score - 1.050 - significant at the .500 level

MUSIC TRAINING CATEGORY	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
I	1	7	4	0	0	0.7500
II	2	9	6	3	0	0.5000
III	1	2	5	4	0	0.0000
IV	3	1	3	1	0	0.7500
V	5	5	4	1	2	0.5882

TABLE 4C-16

Preference Responses in Terms of Music Training
Composition # 16 Fourth Concert

F score - .611 - not significant

MUSIC TRAINING CATEGORY	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
I	1	6	4	1	0	0.5833
II	3	7	8	2	0	0.5500
III	1	4	3	4	0	0.1667
IV	1	5	1	1	0	0.7500
V	2	7	4	2	2	0.2941

TABLE 4C-17

Preference Responses in Terms of Music Training
Composition # 17 Fourth Concert

F score - 1.188 - significant at the .500 level

MUSIC TRAINING CATEGORY	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
I	0	3	4	3	2	-0.3333
II	2	7	7	3	1	0.3000
III	1	7	2	1	1	0.5000
IV	1	3	2	2	0	0.3750
V	5	2	7	2	1	0.4706

TABLE 4C-18

Preference Responses in Terms of Music Training
Composition # 18 Fourth Concert

MUSIC TRAINING CATEGORY	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
I	1	3	5	2	1	0.0833
II	1	4	11	4	0	0.1000
III	2	5	4	1	0	0.6667
IV	1	4	2	1	0	0.6250
V	2	6	6	2	1	0.3529

TABLE 4C-19

Preference Responses in Terms of Music Training
Composition # 19 Fourth Concert

F score - .326 - not significant

MUSIC TRAINING CATEGORY	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
I	3	5	3	1	0	0.8333
II	6	4	6	3	1	0.5500
III	4	5	2	1	0	1.0000
IV	2	3	1	2	0	0.6250
V	6	5	1	3	2	0.5882

TABLE 4C-20

Preference Responses in Terms of Music Training
Composition # 20 Fourth Concert

F score - .735 - not significant

MUSIC TRAINING CATEGORY	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
I	9	1	0	1	1	1.3333
II	8	7	3	2	0	1.0500
III	6	4	2	0	0	1.2500
IV	6	2	0	0	0	1.7500
V	11	2	1	0	3	1.0588

TABLE 4C-21

Preference Responses in Terms of Music Training
Composition # 21 Fourth Concert

F score - .210 - not significant

MUSIC TRAINING CATEGORY	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
I	3	5	4	0	0	0.9167
II	9	5	3	1	2	0.9000
III	4	6	1	1	0	1.0833
IV	5	2	0	1	0	1.3750
V	8	5	2	2	0	1.1176

Analysis of the data in terms of the independent variable, Educational Attainment. Table 4D indicates the distribution of the auditors forming the sample for the Fourth Concert in terms of Educational Attainment. Only three groups were large enough to be considered of value in the statistical analysis of the data. And one of those groups (the "received master's degree" group) was substantially smaller than the other two, which limited the significance that could be derived from statistical differences related to it.

Only the responses to Composition # 1 (Ives - Processional) provided significant differences in the mean responses of the two largest groups, "attended college, didn't graduate" and "college graduate." The F score was .976, which was significant at the .500 level. The negative mean response of the "attended college, didn't graduate" group, when compared with the higher positive mean response of the "college graduate" group, provides a basis for the limited significance. Since this was the only time that such a difference occurred, it provided little in the way of information as to the role Educational Attainment played in the shaping of response patterns. (See Table 4D-1.)

The responses to three compositions provided significantly different mean responses between the "received master's degree" group, and the "attended college, didn't graduate" and "college graduate" groups: Composition # 10 (George - Laughing Song), with an F score of 1.696, significant at the .750 level; Composition # 17 (Ogdon - A clear Midnight), with an F score of 1.288, significant at the .500 level; and Composition # 19 (Ogdon - The Last Invocation), with an F score of 1.272, significant at the .500 level. In each case the lower mean of the response "received master's degree" group differed significantly from the higher mean responses of the other two groups. Each utilized a special vocal effect. (See Tables 4D-10, 4D-17, and 4D-19.)

The responses to Composition # 18 (Ogdon - Madrigal), while yielding an F score of .962, significant at the .500 level, provided no real significant difference since the only mean responses which differed significantly were those of the two groups which were too small to be of statistical value. Hence this evidence was of no real value to the study. (See Table 4D-18.)

The responses to the remaining compositions were not statistically significant.

TABLE 4D

Educational Attainment of the Auditors - Fourth Concert

Educational Attainment	Number
high school graduate	2
att.coll.,didn't grad.	30
college graduate	26
received master's degree	8
received doctor's degree	3
Total	69

TABLE 4D-1

Preference Responses in Terms of Educational Attainment
Composition # 1 Fourth Concert

F score - .976 - significant at the .500 level

EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
high school graduate	0	0	0	1	1	-1.5000
att.coll.,didn't grad.	2	10	6	4	8	-0.2000
college graduate	4	9	5	7	1	0.3077
rec'd. master's deg.	2	1	1	4	0	0.1250
rec'd. doctor's deg.	0	2	1	0	0	0.6667

TABLE 4D-2

Preference Responses in Terms of Educational Attainment
Composition # 2 Fourth Concert

F score - .480 - not significant

EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
high school graduate	2	0	0	0	0	2.0000
att.coll.,didn't grad	18	10	1	1	0	1.5000
college graduate	13	10	1	1	1	1.2692
rec'd. master's deg.	4	4	0	0	0	1.5000
rec'd. doctor's deg.	0	3	0	0	0	1.0000

TABLE 4D-3

Preference Responses in Terms of Educational Attainment
Composition # 3 Fourth Concert

F score - .252 - not significant

EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
high school graduate	2	0	0	0	0	2.0000
att.coll.,didn't grad.	15	14	1	0	0	1.4667
college graduate	12	10	2	1	1	1.1923
rec'd. master's deg.	3	4	1	0	0	1.2500
rec'd. doctor's deg.	1	2	0	0	0	1.3333

TABLE 4D-4

Preference Responses in Terms of Educational Attainment
Composition # 4 Fourth Concert

F score - .421 - not significant

EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
high school graduate	2	0	0	0	0	2.0000
att.coll.,didn't grad.	13	13	3	1	0	1.2667
college graduate	13	9	2	2	0	1.2692
rec'd. master's deg.	3	2	2	1	0	0.8750
rec'd. doctor's deg.	0	3	0	0	0	1.0000

TABLE 4D-5

Preference Responses in Terms of Educational Attainment
Composition # 5 Fourth Concert

F score .194 - not significant

EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
high school graduate	0	2	0	0	0	1.0000
att.coll.,didn't grad.	12	16	2	0	0	1.3333
college graduate	10	13	1	0	2	1.1154
rec'd. master's deg.	4	1	3	0	0	1.1250
rec'd. doctor's deg.	2	0	0	1	0	1.0000

TABLE 4D-6

Preference Responses in Terms of Educational Attainment
Composition # 6 Fourth Concert

F score - .751 - not significant

EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
high school graduate	0	1	1	0	0	0.5000
att.coll.,didn't grad.	3	19	7	1	0	0.8000
college graduate	4	17	4	1	0	0.9231
rec'd. master's deg.	1	3	1	3	0	0.2500
rec'd. doctor's deg.	1	1	0	0	1	0.3333

TABLE 4D-7

Preference Responses in Terms of Educational Attainment
Composition # 7 Fourth Concert

F score - .526 - not significant

EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
high school graduate	2	0	0	0	0	2.0000
att.coll.,didn't grad.	11	13	4	2	0	1.1000
college graduate	14	6	4	1	1	1.1923
rec'd. master's deg.	4	1	0	3	0	0.7500
rec'd. doctor's deg.	0	1	0	0	2	-1.0000

TABLE 4D-8

Preference Responses in Terms of Educational Attainment
Composition # 8 Fourth Concert

F score - .625 - not significant

EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
high school graduate	0	0	1	1	0	-0.5000
att.coll.,didn't grad.	4	14	11	1	0	0.7000
college graduate	4	12	5	4	0	0.6154
rec'd. master's deg.	1	3	3	1	0	0.5000
rec'd. doctor's deg.	1	0	1	1	0	-0.3333

TABLE 4D-9

Preference Responses in Terms of Educational Attainment
Composition # 9 Fourth Concert

F score - .853 - not significant

EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
high school graduate	0	2	0	0	0	1.0000
att.coll.,didn't grad.	8	10	6	6	0	0.6667
college graduate	5	9	7	3	2	0.4615
rec'd. master's deg.	3	2	2	1	0	0.8750
rec'd. doctor's deg.	0	0	1	1	1	-1.0000

TABLE 4D-10

Preference Responses in Terms of Educational Attainment
Composition # 10 Fourth Concert

F score - 1.696 - significant at the .750 level

EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
high school graduate	0	0	1	1	0	-0.5000
att.coll.,didn't grad.	15	12	2	0	1	1.3333
college graduate	13	7	4	2	0	1.1923
rec'd.master's deg.	2	2	2	2	0	0.5000
rec'd.doctor's deg.	1	1	0	0	1	0.3333

TABLE 4D-11

Preference Responses in Terms of Educational Attainment
Composition # 11 Fourth Concert

F score - .540 - not significant

EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
high school graduate	0	1	0	0	1	-0.5000
att.coll.,didn't grad.	10	10	6	3	1	0.8333
college graduate	3	17	5	1	0	0.8462
rec'd. master's deg.	2	2	3	1	0	0.6250
rec'd. doctor's deg.	1	1	0	1	0	0.6667

TABLE 4D-12

Preference Responses in Terms of Educational Attainment
Composition # 12 Fourth Concert

F score - .596 - not significant

EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
high school graduate	0	1	1	0	0	0.5000
att.coll.,didn't grad.	2	11	13	4	0	0.3667
college graduate	2	9	8	7	0	0.2308
rec'd. master's deg.	1	1	2	2	2	-0.3750
rec'd. doctor's deg.	1	0	1	0	1	0.0000

TABLE 4D-13

Preference Responses in Terms of Educational Attainment
Composition # 13 Fourth Concert

F score - .092 - not significant

EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
high school graduate	0	1	0	0	1	-0.5000
att.coll.,didn't grad.	4	7	8	7	4	0.0000
college graduate	4	5	6	9	2	0.0000
rec'd. master's deg.	1	2	3	0	2	0.0000
rec'd. doctor's deg.	1	1	0	0	1	0.3333

TABLE 4D-14

Preference Responses in Terms of Educational Attainment
Composition # 14 Fourth Concert

F score - .382 - not significant

EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
high school graduate	2	0	0	0	0	2.0000
att.coll.,didn't grad.	22	6	2	0	0	1.6667
college graduate	19	6	0	1	0	1.6538
rec'd. master's deg.	6	1	1	0	0	1.6250
rec'd. doctor's deg.	3	0	0	0	0	2.0000

TABLE 4D-15

Preference Responses in Terms of Educational Attainment
Composition # 15 Fourth Concert

F score - .778 - not significant

EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
high school graduate	0	1	0	1	0	0.0000
att.coll.,didn't grad.	6	8	12	4	0	0.5333
college graduate	2	13	7	3	1	0.4615
rec'd. master's deg.	2	1	3	1	1	0.2500
rec'd. doctor's deg.	2	1	0	0	0	1.6667

TABLE 4D-16

Preference Responses in Terms of Educational Attainment
Composition # 16 Fourth Concert

F score - .836 - not significant

EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
high school graduate	0	0	0	2	0	-1.0000
att.coll.,didn't grad.	4	10	11	5	0	0.4333
college graduate	2	14	7	2	1	0.5385
rec'd. master's deg.	1	3	2	1	1	0.2500
rec'd. doctor's deg.	1	2	0	0	0	1.3333

TABLE 4D-17

Preference Responses in Terms of Educational Attainment
Composition # 17 Fourth Concert

F score - 1.288 - significant at the .500 level

EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
high school graduate	0	1	1	0	0	0.5000
att.coll.,didn't grad.	2	10	10	6	2	0.1333
college graduate	5	6	11	3	1	0.4231
rec'd. master's deg.	0	4	0	2	2	-0.2500
rec'd doctor's deg.	2	1	0	0	0	1.6667

TABLE 4D-18

Preference Responses in Terms of Educational Attainment
Composition # 18 Fourth Concert

F score - .962 - significant at the .500 level

EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
high school graduate	1	1	0	0	0	1.5000
att.coll.,didn't grad.	1	9	17	3	0	0.2667
college graduate	2	8	9	6	1	0.1538
rec'd. master's deg.	2	3	1	1	1	0.5000
rec'd. doctor's deg.	1	1	1	0	0	1.0000

TABLE 4D-19

Preference Responses in Terms of Educational Attainment
Composition # 19 Fourth Concert

F score - 1.272 - significant at the .500 level

EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
high school graduate	1	1	0	0	0	1.5000
att.coll.,didn't grad.	7	11	8	3	1	0.6667
college graduate	9	9	2	6	0	0.8077
rec'd. master's deg.	2	1	2	1	2	0.0000
rec'd. doctor's deg.	2	0	1	0	0	1.3333

TABLE 4D-20

Preference Responses in Terms of Educational Attainment
Composition # 20 Fourth Concert

F score - .475 - not significant

EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
high school graduate	2	0	0	0	0	2.0000
att.coll.,didn't grad.	17	8	2	0	3	1.2000
college graduate	16	5	3	2	0	1.3462
rec'd. master's deg.	3	2	1	1	1	0.6250
rec'd. doctor's deg.	2	1	0	0	0	1.6667

TABLE 4D-21

Preference Responses in Terms of Educational Attainment
Composition # 21 Fourth Concert

F score - .717 - not significant

EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
high school graduate	0	1	0	1	0	0.0000
att.coll.,didn't grad.	11	13	4	1	1	1.0667
college graduate	13	7	5	1	0	1.2308
rec'd. master's deg.	3	2	0	2	1	0.5000
rec'd. doctor's deg.	2	0	1	0	0	1.3333

Analysis of the data in terms of the independent variable, Familiarity. Tables 4E-1 through 4E-17 list the preference responses to the Familiarity Scale for the 21 compositions of the Fourth Concert. As was noted in connection with the compositions performed on the three preceding concerts, the distribution was heavily skewed towards unfamiliarity with at least eighty percent of the auditors indicating "unfamiliarity" with 16 compositions. Statistically there was a significant difference in the mean responses and the distribution of preference responses for only four compositions. And in each case the level of significance was low.

The F score for Composition # 4 (Barber - Mary Hynes) was 2.062, which was significant at the .750 level. The basis for the significant difference was the low mean response of those who selected "not sure", the middle degree of the Scale. The number of auditors forming this group was too small to be of any real significance, hence the difference noted was of limited value. (See Table 4E-4.)

For Composition # 5 (Dello Joio - A Fable) the responses yielded an F score of 1.941, which was also significant at the .750 level. The lowest mean response was given by those indicating "familiarity" with the work. Again the number of auditors expressing "familiarity" was small (approximately twelve percent). Hence the observed difference in mean responses and the distribution of responses was of limited significance. (See Table 4E-5.)

The responses to Composition # 7 (Labunski - The Clock) yielded an F score of .750, which was significant at the .500 level. The highest mean response came from the auditors expressing "unfamiliarity" with the work. Those expressing "familiarity" or "not sure" responded significantly lower. Again the small size of the groups expressing "familiarity" served to make the observed difference of doubtful value. (See Table 4E-7.)

The responses to Composition # 20 (Toch - Geographical Fugue) yielded an F score of .741, also significant at the .500 level. Those expressing "familiarity" gave the highest mean response, while those expressing "unfamiliarity" provided the lowest mean response. Again the significance is of limited value. (See Table 4E-20.)

No patterns of responses were observed which would indicate that familiarity with the composition would lead to a more favorable response.

TABLE 4E-1

Preference Responses in Terms of Familiarity
Composition # 1 Fourth Concert

F score - .347 - not significant

DEGREE OF FAMILIARITY	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
Familiar A (10)	2	3	1	2	2	0.1000
Not sure B (2)	0	1	1	0	0	0.5000
Unfamiliar C (57)	6	18	11	14	8	0.0000

TABLE 4E-2

Preference Responses in Terms of Familiarity
Composition # 2 Fourth Concert

F score - .106 - not significant

DEGREE OF FAMILIARITY	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
Familiar A (20)	15	4	0	1	1	1.4762
Not sure B (11)	5	5	1	0	0	1.3636
Unfamiliar C (37)	17	18	1	1	0	1.3784

TABLE 4E-3

Preference Responses in Terms of Familiarity
Composition # 3 Fourth Concert

F score - .804 - not significant

DEGREE OF FAMILIARITY	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
Familiar A (11)	7	3	0	0	1	1.1818
Not sure B (8)	2	4	2	0	0	1.0000
Unfamiliar C (50)	24	23	2	1	0	1.4000

TABLE 4E-4

Preference Responses in Terms of Familiarity
Composition # 4 Fourth Concert

F score - 2.062 - significant at the .750 level

DEGREE OF FAMILIARITY	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
Familiar A (9)	7	1	0	1	0	1.5556
Not sure B (6)	1	3	1	1	0	0.6667
Unfamiliar C (54)	23	23	6	2	0	1.2407

TABLE 4E-5

Preference Responses in Terms of Familiarity
Composition # 5 Fourth Concert

F score - 1.941 - significant at the .750 level

DEGREE OF FAMILIARITY	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
Familiar A (8)	3	3	0	0	2	0.6250
Not sure B (5)	3	2	0	0	0	1.6000
Unfamiliar C (56)	22	27	6	1	0	1.2500

TABLE 4E-6

Preference Responses in Terms of Familiarity
Composition # 6 Fourth Concert

F score - .070 - not significant

DEGREE OF FAMILIARITY	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
Familiar A (5)	1	2	2	0	0	0.8000
Not sure B (2)	0	2	0	0	0	1.0000
Unfamiliar C (62)	8	37	11	5	1	0.7419

TABLE 4E-7

Preference Responses in Terms of Familiarity
Composition # 7 Fourth Concert

F score .750 - significant at the .500 level

Familiar A (7)	1	3	2	1	0	0.5714
Not sure B (3)	2	0	0	0	1	0.6667
Unfamiliar C (59)	28	18	6	5	2	1.1017

TABLE 4E-8

Preference Responses in Terms of Familiarity
Composition # 8 Fourth Concert

F score - .121 - not significant

DEGREE OF FAMILIARITY	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
Familiar A (3)	1	0	1	1	0	0.3333
Not sure B (5)	0	3	2	0	0	0.6000
Unfamiliar C (61)	10	26	18	7	0	0.6393

TABLE 4E-9

Preference Responses in Terms of Familiarity
Composition # 9 Fourth Concert

F score - .641 - not significant

DEGREE OF FAMILIARITY	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
Familiar A (5)	0	3	0	1	1	0.0000
Not sure B (7)	1	3	1	2	0	0.4286
Unfamiliar C (57)	15	17	15	8	2	0.6140

TABLE 4E-10

Preference Responses in Terms of Familiarity
Composition # 10 Fourth Concert

F score - .428 - not significant

DEGREE OF FAMILIARITY	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
Familiar A (10)	6	2	1	1	0	1.3000
Not sure B (2)	1	1	0	0	0	1.5000
Unfamiliar C (57)	24	19	8	4	2	1.0351

TABLE 4E-11

Preference Responses in Terms of Familiarity
Composition # 11 Fourth Concert

F score - .095 - not significant

DEGREE OF FAMILIARITY	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
Familiar A (4)	1	1	1	1	0	0.5000
Not sure B (4)	0	3	1	0	0	0.7500
Unfamiliar C (61)	15	27	12	5	2	0.7869

TABLE 4E-12

Preference Responses in Terms of Familiarity
Composition # 12 Fourth Concert

F score - .412 - not significant

DEGREE OF FAMILIARITY	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
Familiar A (3)	0	0	1	1	1	-1.0000
Not sure B (1)	0	0	1	0	0	0.0000
Unfamiliar C (65)	6	22	23	12	2	0.2308

TABLE 4E-13

Preference Responses in Terms of Familiarity
Composition # 13 Fourth Concert

F score - .538 - not significant

DEGREE OF FAMILIARITY	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
Familiar A (6)	0	2	0	3	1	-0.5000
Not sure B (4)	1	0	2	0	1	0.0000
Unfamiliar C (59)	9	14	15	13	8	0.0508

TABLE 4E-14

Preference Responses in Terms of Familiarity
Composition # 14 Fourth Concert

F score - .000 - not significant

DEGREE OF FAMILIARITY	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
Familiar A (8)	6	1	1	0	0	1.6250
Not sure B (7)	6	1	0	0	0	1.8571
Unfamiliar C (54)	40	11	2	1	0	1.6667

TABLE 4E-15

Preference Responses in Terms of Familiarity
Composition # 15 Fourth Concert

F score - .421 - not significant

DEGREE OF FAMILIARITY	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
Familiar A (12)	4	4	2	1	1	0.7500
Not sure B (8)	1	2	5	0	0	0.5000
Unfamiliar C (49)	7	18	15	8	1	0.4490

TABLE 4E-16

Preference Responses in Terms of Familiarity
Composition # 16 Fourth Concert

F score - .203 - not significant

DEGREE OF FAMILIARITY	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
Familiar A (11)	3	4	2	1	1	0.3646
Not sure B (7)	0	3	3	1	0	0.2857
Unfamiliar C (51)	5	22	15	8	1	0.4314

TABLE 4E-17

Preference Responses in Terms of Familiarity
Composition # 17 Fourth Concert

F score - .408 - not significant

DEGREE OF FAMILIARITY	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
Familiar A (1)	0	0	0	0	1	-2.0000
Not sure B (1)	0	1	0	0	0	1.0000
Unfamiliar C (67)	9	21	22	11	4	0.2985

TABLE 4E-18

Preference Responses in Terms of Familiarity
Composition # 18 Fourth Concert

F score - .153 - not significant

DEGREE OF FAMILIARITY	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
Familiar A (2)	0	0	0	1	1	-1.5000
Not sure B (3)	0	1	0	1	1	-0.6667
Unfamiliar C (64)	7	21	28	8	0	0.4219

TABLE 4E-19

Preference Responses in Terms of Familiarity
Composition # 19 Fourth Concert

F score - .253 - not significant

DEGREE OF FAMILIARITY	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
Familiar A (3)	1	1	1	0	0	1.0000
Not sure B (2)	0	0	0	1	1	-1.0000
Unfamiliar C (64)	20	21	12	9	2	0.7500

TABLE 4E-20

Preference Responses in Terms of Familiarity
Composition # 20 Fourth Concert

F score - .741 - significant at the .500 level

DEGREE OF FAMILIARITY	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
Familiar A (16)	12	2	1	0	1	1.5000
Not sure B (2)	1	1	0	0	0	1.5000
Unfamiliar C (51)	27	13	5	3	3	1.1373

TABLE 4E-21

Preference Responses in Terms of Familiarity
Composition # 21 Fourth Concert

F score - .553 - not significant

DEGREE OF FAMILIARITY	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
Familiar A (5)	2	2	1	0	0	1.2000
Not sure B (2)	0	0	1	1	0	-0.5000
Unfamiliar C (62)	27	21	8	4	2	1.0806

Analysis of the data in terms of preference responses. Table 4F contains the summary of preference responses to each composition. A study of the distributions of responses and the mean response for each composition indicated a fairly wide range of responses for the different compositions. This was also indicated by the scores of the t test when each composition was compared with every other composition to determine whether or not the differences in responses were statistically significant. At this point the researcher determined, rather than list the resultant 210 t scores, that a general discussion of the import of the comparisons would be more appropriate.

It is important to note at this point that preference responses are of relative value. That is to say, an auditor would not be expected to respond to the same composition with the same degree of preference each time he heard the work. On the other hand, the auditor will tend to respond in a relative sense, relating his response to a second composition to the first, thus indicating how he related one composition to another in terms of his aesthetic attitude (preference) at the time. A fundamental assumption underlying this study was that an auditor would not significantly change his basic attitudes during a particular concert. Therefore it was valid to assume that an examination of preference responses in a relative sense would provide information that would be of value in assisting in the determination of the nature of an auditor's attitudes towards the music of any one concert.

Hence a relatively simple way to compare the preference responses to the 21 compositions of the Fourth Concert was to list the mean responses to each composition in a rank order, from high to low, and compare such a ranking with the t scores previously obtained. Table 4F-1 is the rank order listing of the mean responses for the 21 compositions.

Where a significant difference, determined by the t test did occur the mean responses were separated by one vertical space. For example, the comparison of the responses to Composition # 14 (Whikehart - Love of God) and Composition # 2 (Willan - Rise up, etc.) yielded a t score of 1.917, which was significant at the .950 level, indicating a significant difference in the way the auditors responded to the two compositions. Therefore, in Table 4F-1, the mean preference responses to the two compositions are separated by a space.

The comparison of the responses to Composition # 2 (Willan - Rise up, etc.) and Composition # 3 (Lockwood - Monotone, etc.) yielded a t score of .383, which was not significant. Therefore the two mean preference responses were not separated in the table.

In order for the preference responses to two compositions to be statistically different at the .750 level (the lowest level of significance), the mean preference responses must have differed by at least 0.1100 of a degree, as related to the five degrees of the preference scale.

For the preference responses to two compositions to be statistically different at the .995 level (the highest level of significance), the mean responses must have differed by at least 0.4750 of a degree, as related to the five degrees of the preference scale.

It should be noted that the difference in the mean responses was not the sole basis for determining significant difference, but rather the comparison of the mean responses as well as the variance along the Preference Scale (distribution of responses among the five degrees of the Scale) led to the determination of the statistical significance. However, the statistical difference was made more readily apparent by the comparison of the mean preference responses.

In general the consonant and traditional sounding works were received more favorably by the auditors. Those compositions which were quite dissonant and, from the standpoint of music characteristics, departed most from the traditional styles, were received less favorably, and, in terms of mean preference responses, were ranked towards the bottom of the rank order listing.

A comparison of the responses to the three works by Gaburo illustrate this point. The three compositions selected for performance, Composition # 11 (Snow), Composition # 12 (The Cry), and Composition # 13 (Terra Tremuit), were presented because they represented changes in the compositional style of Gaburo. Composition # 11, an earlier work, was more traditional in style. Composition # 13, on the other hand, was a 12-tone work which illustrated his development towards modernity. A comparison of the responses to the two compositions yielded a t score of 4.254, which was significant at the .995 level.

The same comparison between Composition # 12 and # 11 yielded a t score of 3.262, which was also significant at the .995 level. The comparison between Composition # 13 and # 12 yielded a t score of 1.202, which was significant at the .750 level. Thus, the manner in which the auditors responded to the three works was commensurate with the stylistic changes from traditional to modern styles which were represented in the three works.

Differences in responses as a result of the utilizing of specific stylistic techniques were also apparent. This was apparent in the two compositions by Labunski, Composition # 6 (First, the poem must be magical) and Composition # 7 (The Clock). The t score obtained in a comparison of the responses to these two compositions was 1.628, which was significant at the .900 level. The special "tick-tock" effect utilized in Composition # 7 apparently affected the manner in which the auditors responded to the work in a significantly different way.

A second composition which utilized a special effect was Composition # 10 (George - Laughing Song). The "ha-ha-ha" refrain was a dominant characteristic of the work. A comparison of the responses to Composition # 7 and Composition # 10 yielded a t score of .323, which was not significant, indicating there was no significant difference in the manner in which the auditors responded to the two works.

TABLE 4F

Summary of Preference Responses for each Composition
Fourth Concert

COMPOSITION	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean	Standard Deviation
1	8	22	13	16	10	0.0290	1.2800
2	37	27	2	2	1	1.4058	.8000
3	33	30	4	1	1	1.3478	.7800
4	31	27	7	4	0	1.2819	.8500
5	28	32	6	1	2	1.2029	.8800
6	9	41	13	5	1	0.7536	.8200
7	31	21	8	6	3	1.0290	1.1400
8	11	29	21	8	0	0.6232	.8800
9	16	23	16	11	3	0.5507	1.1300
10	31	22	9	5	2	1.0870	1.0600
11	16	31	14	6	2	0.7681	.9900
12	6	22	25	13	3	0.2174	.9900
13	10	16	17	16	10	0.0000	1.2700
14	52	13	3	1	0	1.6812	.6200
15	12	24	22	9	2	0.5072	1.0100
16	8	29	20	10	2	0.4493	.9700
17	9	22	22	11	5	0.2754	1.1000
18	7	22	28	10	2	0.3188	.9400
19	21	22	13	10	3	0.6957	1.1700
20	40	16	6	3	4	1.2319	1.1400
21	29	23	10	5	2	1.0435	1.0500

TABLE 4F-1

Rank Order of Mean Preference Responses
Fourth Concert

Composition-Composer	Mean
14 Whikehart	1.6812
2 Willan	1.4058
3 Lockwood	1.3478
4 Barber	1.2319
20 Toch	1.2319
5 Dello Joio	1.2029
10 George	1.0870
21 Rochberg	1.0435
7 Labunski	1.0290
11 Gaburo	0.7681
6 Labunski	0.7536
19 Ogdon	0.6957
8 Ming	0.6232
9 Ming	0.5507
15 Stravinsky	0.5972
16 Stravinsky	0.4493
18 Ogdon	0.3188
17 Ogdon	0.2754
12 Gaburo	0.2174
1 Ives	0.0290
13 Gaburo	0.0000

Analysis of the responses to the Index of Stylistic Characteristics. The responses to the Index of Stylistic Characteristics were examined in relation to the stylistic analyses of the compositions performed. (See Appendix H for the complete stylistic analyses of the works performed at the Fourth Concert.)

The relatively short duration of most of the compositions performed did not allow the auditor an opportunity to give consideration to a number of characteristics. Hence only the first choices of the auditors were extracted and studied. Less than one-half of the auditors selected two or more characteristics for each composition. Tables 4G-1 through 4G-22 contain the summary of the first choices of the auditors in terms of Music Training. An overall summary of first choices is also given in each table.

Certain patterns of selection of stylistic characteristics which appeared in the responses of auditors at the three previous concerts also were present in the responses to the 21 compositions of the Fourth Concert.

First, the responses to those compositions which were generally consonant, utilizing tertian harmonies, and traditional in form and content, tended to emphasize affective mood characteristics as first choices. Responses to compositions which were generally dissonant and which utilized twentieth century compositional techniques tended to stress music characteristics as first choices.

From the standpoint of formal music training, those with little or no formal training were more likely to select affective mood characteristics as a first choice, and as the extent of formal music training increased the auditors tended to place more emphasis on the selection of music characteristics as first choices. Both patterns were evident in the selections made by the auditors for the 21 compositions.

Table 4G-1 lists the responses to the Index of Stylistic Characteristics for Composition # 1 (Ives - Processional). Sixty-seven percent of the auditors selected music characteristics as a first choice. A total of 12 music characteristics were selected at least once. "Dissonant sounds" (14) was the only music characteristic selected with a relatively high degree of frequency, being chosen 29 times. This was considered significant. Only twenty-two percent of the auditors selected mood characteristics as a first choice. Five mood characteristics were selected at least once, however, none were selected with enough frequency to be considered significant.

An obvious change in the style of Composition # 2 (Willan - Rise up, etc.), when compared to the first work, is evident in the responses to the stylistic characteristics. Sixty-one auditors selected a mood characteristic as a first choice. Only three mood characteristics were selected, with two being selected with a significant frequency, "quiet, lyrical, satisfying, calm" (4) and "sentimental, tender, pleading" (3). Only twenty-eight percent of the auditors selected a music characteristic. Four music characteristics were selected at least once, however, only one was selected with a frequency that would be considered significant, "lyric melody" (10). (See Table 4G-2.)

Composition # 3 (Lockwood - Monotone, etc.), also a consonant and traditional work, was considered by the auditors to have affective mood as the more important style characteristic. Fifty-one percent of the auditors selected four mood characteristics at least once. One mood characteristic was considered significant, namely, "quiet, lyrical, satisfying, calm" (4). Thirty-five percent of the auditors selected ten music characteristics at least once. No one music characteristic stood out as being significant, considering the entire sample. However, Music Training Category II selected "lyric melody" (10) four times, and Music Training Category V selected "consonant sounds" (15) four times, both being considered significant for each category. (See Table 4G-3.)

The less traditional but still consonant style of Composition # 4 (Barber - Mary Hynes) received a greater emphasis on the music characteristics. Fourteen music characteristics were selected at least once by forty-nine percent of the auditors. One music characteristic, "interweaving of melodies, contrapuntal" (21), was selected with enough frequency to be considered significant. Five mood characteristics were selected at least twice by thirty-three percent of the auditors. Only one, "bright, cheerful, gay" (6), was selected with enough frequency to be considered significant. (See Table 4G-4.)

Sixty-two percent of the auditors placed a greater emphasis on the affective mood of Composition # 5 (Dello Joio - A Fable). Three mood characteristics were mentioned, two often enough to be considered significant. They were "humorous, light, graceful" (5) and "bright, cheerful, gay" (6). Twenty-three percent of the auditors selected twelve music characteristics at least once, however, no one characteristic was selected often enough to be considered significant. (See Table 4G-5.)

TABLE 4G-1

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 1 Fourth Concert
Overall Summary

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	FIRST CHOICES BY MUSIC TRAINING CATEGORIES I	II	III	IV	V	TOTAL FIRST CHOICES
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS						
1	3	1	1	-	1	6
2	-	3	1	-	-	4
4	1	-	-	-	-	1
7	-	-	1	-	1	2
8	-	2	-	-	-	2
Totals	4	6	3	-	2	15
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS						
Pervading Characteristics						
30	-	-	-	-	1	1
35	-	1	-	-	-	1
Totals	-	1	-	-	1	2
Significant Characteristics						
11	-	1	-	1	-	2
14	4	8	3	2	12	29
15	-	-	1	-	-	1
18	1	-	-	-	-	1
Totals	5	9	4	3	12	33

TABLE 4G-1 (continued)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	FIRST CHOICES BY MUSIC TRAINING CATEGORIES I	II	III	IV	V	TOTAL FIRST CHOICES
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS (continued)						
Peripheral Characteristics						
16	-	-	-	1	-	1
Totals	-	-	-	1	-	1
Characteristics not related						
9	1	2	-	-	-	3
12	-	-	2	1	1	4
17	-	-	1	-	-	1
25	1	-	-	-	-	1
26	-	-	-	-	1	1
Totals	2	2	3	1	2	10
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES						
Mood Characteristics	4	6	3	-	2	15
% of total	(33.3)	(30.0)	(25.0)	(00.0)	(11.8)	(21.7)
Music Characteristics	7	12	7	5	15	46
% of total	(58.3)	(60.0)	(58.3)	(62.5)	(88.2)	(66.7)
No. of no responses	1	2	2	3	-	8
% of total	(8.4)	(10.0)	(16.7)	(37.5)	(00.0)	(11.6)

TABLE 4G-2

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 2 Fourth Concert
Overall Summary

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	FIRST CHOICES BY MUSIC TRAINING CATEGORIES					TOTAL FIRST CHOICES
	I	II	III	IV	V	
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS						
1	1	1	1	-	1	4
3	4	4	1	1	4	14
4	4	7	5	3	5	24
Totals	9	12	7	4	10	42
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS						
Pervading Characteristics						
10	1	5	2	-	4	12
15	-	2	2	-	1	5
30	-	-	-	1	-	1
Totals	1	7	4	1	5	18
Significant Characteristics						
NONE						
Peripheral Characteristics						
NONE						
Characteristics not related						
34	-	-	-	-	1	1
Totals	-	-	-	-	1	1
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES						
Mood Characteristics	9	12	7	4	10	42
% of total	(75.0)	(60.0)	(58.4)	(50.0)	(58.8)	(60.9)
Music Characteristics	1	7	4	1	6	19
% of total	(8.3)	(35.0)	(33.3)	(12.5)	(35.3)	(27.5)
No. of no responses	2	1	1	3	1	8
% of total	(16.7)	(5.0)	(8.3)	(37.5)	(5.9)	(11.6)

TABLE 4G-3

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 3 Fourth Concert
Overall Summary

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	FIRST CHOICES BY MUSIC TRAINING CATEGORIES I	II	III	IV	V	TOTAL FIRST CHOICES
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS						
1	2	-	2	-	1	5
2	1	-	-	-	-	1
3	1	1	2	1	1	6
4	6	9	3	1	4	23
Totals	10	10	7	2	6	35
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS						
Pervading Characteristics						
15	-	-	-	-	4	4
18	-	-	-	1	-	1
26	-	2	1	2	1	6
30	-	1	1	-	2	4
Totals	-	3	2	3	7	15
Significant Characteristics						
10	-	4	-	-	-	4
Totals	-	4	-	-	-	4
Peripheral Characteristics						
21	-	-	1	-	-	1
Totals	-	-	1	-	-	1
Characteristics not related						
9	-	-	-	-	1	1
14	-	-	-	-	1	1
19	1	-	-	-	-	1
22	-	1	-	-	-	1
Totals	1	1	-	-	2	4

TABLE 4G-3 (continued)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	FIRST CHOICES BY MUSIC TRAINING CATEGORIES I	II	III	IV	V	TOTAL FIRST CHOICES
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES						
Mood Characteristics	10	10	7	2	6	35
% of total	(83.4)	(50.0)	(58.3)	(25.0)	(35.3)	(50.7)
Music Characteristics	1	8	3	3	9	24
% of total	(8.3)	(40.0)	(25.0)	(37.5)	(52.9)	(34.8)
No. of no responses	1	2	2	3	2	10
% of total	(8.3)	(10.0)	(16.7)	(37.5)	(11.8)	(14.5)

TABLE 4G-4

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 4 Fourth Concert
Overall Summary

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	FIRST CHOICES BY MUSIC TRAINING CATEGORIES I	II	III	IV	V	TOTAL FIRST CHOICES
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS						
3	-	1	-	1	-	2
4	1	1	-	-	-	2
5	-	-	1	1	-	2
6	3	4	3	-	3	13
7	1	-	-	-	3	4
Totals	5	6	4	2	6	23
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS						
Pervading Characteristics						
15	-	1	-	-	-	1
18	-	-	-	-	1	1
30	2	-	-	-	2	4
Totals	2	1	-	-	3	6

TABLE 4G-4 (continued)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	FIRST CHOICES BY MUSIC TRAINING CATEGORIES I	II	III	IV	V	TOTAL FIRST CHOICES
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS (continued)						
Significant Characteristics						
10	-	1	1	1	-	3
21	2	5	1	1	4	13
Totals	2	6	2	2	4	16
Peripheral Characteristics						
9	-	-	1	-	-	1
31	-	-	1	-	-	1
36	-	-	-	1	1	2
Totals	-	-	2	1	1	4
Characteristics not related						
12	-	1	-	-	-	1
22	-	1	-	-	-	1
25	-	1	1	-	-	2
33	-	1	-	-	-	1
34	-	1	-	-	-	1
37	1	-	-	-	1	2
Totals	1	5	1	-	1	8
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES						
Mood Characteristics	5	6	4	2	6	23
% of total	(41.7)	(30.0)	(33.3)	(25.0)	(35.3)	(33.3)
Music Characteristics	5	12	5	3	9	34
% of total	(41.7)	(60.0)	(41.7)	(37.5)	(52.9)	(49.3)
No. of no responses	2	2	3	3	2	12
% of total	(16.6)	(10.0)	(25.0)	(37.5)	(11.8)	(17.4)

TABLE 4G-5

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 5 Fourth Concert
Overall Summary

	FIRST CHOICES BY MUSIC TRAINING CATEGORIES					TOTAL FIRST CHOICES
CHARACTERISTIC NO.	I	II	III	IV	V	
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS						
5	6	7	5	4	5	27
6	1	6	1	1	3	12
7	-	-	2	-	2	4
Totals	7	13	8	5	10	43
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS						
Pervading Characteristics						
30	-	-	2	-	1	3
34	-	-	1	-	-	1
Totals	-	-	3	-	1	4
Significant Characteristics						
10	1	1	-	-	-	2
21	-	-	-	-	1	1
Totals	1	1	-	-	1	3
Peripheral Characteristics						
16	-	-	-	-	1	1
22	1	-	-	-	-	1
Totals	1	-	-	-	1	2
Characteristics not related						
9	-	-	-	-	1	1
14	-	1	-	-	-	1
23	-	1	-	-	-	1
27	-	-	-	-	1	1
33	-	1	-	-	-	1
37	1	-	-	-	-	1
Totals	1	4	-	-	2	6

TABLE 4G-5 (continued)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	FIRST CHOICES BY MUSIC TRAINING CATEGORIES I	II	III	IV	V	TOTAL FIRST CHOICES
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES						
Mood Characteristics	7	13	8	5	10	43
% of total	(58.3)	(65.0)	(66.7)	(62.5)	(58.8)	(62.3)
Music Characteristics	3	5	3	-	5	16
% of total	(25.0)	(20.0)	(25.0)	(00.0)	(29.4)	(23.2)
No. of no responses	2	2	1	3	2	10
% of total	(16.7)	(10.0)	(8.3)	(37.5)	(11.8)	(14.5)

Table 4G-6 lists the responses to the Index of Stylistic Characteristics for Composition # 6 (Labunski - Poem must be magical). Responses to mood and music characteristics were evenly divided, with forty-one percent of the auditors selecting mood characteristics and forty-two percent selecting music characteristics. Of the four mood characteristics selected at least twice, only one was mentioned enough to be significant, namely, "quiet, lyrical, satisfying, calm" (4). Of the ten music characteristics selected at least once, one, "interweaving of melodies, contrapuntal" (21) was selected frequently enough to be significant.

Music characteristics were considered more important in Composition # 7 (Labunski - Clock). Forty-nine percent of the auditors selected music characteristics, however, their choices were scattered among fifteen different characteristics. It was of significance that eight of the music characteristics selected were not considered by the styles analysts to be related to the composition. Hence the number of times that "irregular melodic contour, disjoint, angular" (9) and "disjointed series of sounds, pointillistic" (19) were selected by those with formal music training (Categories II, III, IV and V) suggests a reaction in a way which was not expected. This reaction probably relates to the "tick-tock" effect which was prominent throughout the song, creating some confusion as to how to indicate the significance of this effect on the Index. Three mood characteristics were selected, of which "humorous, light, graceful" (5) was significant. (See Table 4G-7.)

Composition # 8 (Ming - Silent Slain) was considered by the auditors to have a greater emphasis on mood. Forty-five percent of the auditors selected five mood characteristics. One was significant, "sentimental, tender, pleading" (3). A second was of limited significance, "spiritual, serious, inspiring" (1). One-third of the auditors selected fourteen music characteristics, however, the choices were so scattered that no one music characteristic was singled out as being significant. (See Table 4G-8.)

The second Ming work, Composition # 9 (Nat Bacon's bones) had somewhat of an opposite effect. Only twenty-eight percent selected mood characteristics, six being chosen, but only one of any degree of significance, "dramatic, agitated, exciting, triumphant" (7). Forty-nine percent of the auditors selected fifteen music characteristics, with the choices being scattered to the extent that no one characteristic was selected with enough frequency to be considered significant. However, an unusually large number of characteristics was chosen which were not related to the composition by the styles analysts, again suggesting a degree of confusion among the auditors as to the stylistic features of the composition. (See Table 4G-9.)

TABLE 4G-6

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 6 Fourth Concert
Overall Summary

	FIRST CHOICES BY MUSIC TRAINING CATEGORIES					TOTAL FIRST CHOICES
CHARACTERISTIC NO.	I	II	III	IV	V	
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS						
1	1	2	1	-	1	5
3	1	1	1	1	1	5
4	4	5	4	2	1	16
6	2	-	-	-	-	2
Totals	8	8	6	3	3	28

TABLE 4G-6 (continued)

	FIRST CHOICES BY MUSIC TRAINING CATEGORIES					
CHARACTERISTIC NO.	I	II	III	IV	V	TOTAL FIRST CHOICES
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS						
Pervading Characteristics						
10	1	1	1	1	1	5
13	-	-	-	-	1	1
26	-	2	-	-	1	3
30	-	-	1	-	1	2
Totals	1	3	2	1	4	11
Significant Characteristics						
21	2	3	-	1	7	13
34	-	-	-	-	1	1
Totals	2	3	-	1	8	14
Peripheral Characteristics						
NONE						
Characteristics not related						
9	-	-	1	-	-	1
14	-	1	-	-	-	1
19	-	1	-	-	-	1
20	-	1	-	-	-	1
Totals	-	3	1	-	-	4
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES						
Mood Characteristics	8	8	6	3	3	28
% of total	(66.7)	(40.0)	(50.0)	(37.5)	(17.6)	(40.6)
Music Characteristics	3	9	3	2	12	29
% of total	(25.0)	(45.0)	(25.0)	(25.0)	(70.6)	(42.0)
No. of no responses	1	3	3	3	2	12
% of total	(8.3)	(15.0)	(25.0)	(37.5)	(11.8)	(17.4)

TABLE 4G-7

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 7 Fourth Concert
Overall Summary

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	FIRST CHOICES BY MUSIC TRAINING CATEGORIES I	II	III	IV	V	TOTAL FIRST CHOICES
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS						
4	-	1	1	-	-	2
5	5	3	5	2	3	18
6	-	-	1	1	2	4
Totals	5	4	7	3	5	24
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS						
Pervading Characteristics						
13	-	1	-	-	-	1
18	1	2	-	-	-	3
26	1	1	-	-	-	2
30	2	1	-	1	-	4
34	-	2	-	-	1	3
Totals	4	7	-	1	1	13
Significant Characteristics						
21	-	1	-	-	-	1
23	-	-	-	-	1	1
Totals	-	1	-	-	1	1
Peripheral Characteristics						
NONE						
Characteristics not related						
9	-	1	3	-	3	7
14	-	-	-	-	1	1
16	-	1	-	-	-	1
19	-	4	1	1	-	6
25	-	-	-	-	1	1
32	-	-	-	-	1	1
33	-	-	-	-	1	1
37	1	-	-	-	-	1
Totals	1	6	4	1	7	19

TABLE 4G-7 (continued)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	FIRST CHOICES BY MUSIC TRAINING CATEGORIES I	II	III	IV	V	TOTAL FIRST CHOICES
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES						
Mood Characteristics	5	4	7	3	5	24
% of total	(41.7)	(20.0)	(58.4)	(37.5)	(29.4)	(34.8)
Music Characteristics	5	14	4	2	9	34
% of total	(41.7)	(70.0)	(33.3)	(25.0)	(52.9)	(49.3)
No. of no responses	2	2	1	3	3	11
% of total	(16.6)	(10.0)	(8.3)	(37.5)	(17.7)	(15.9)

TABLE 4G-8

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 8 Fourth Concert
Overall Summary

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	FIRST CHOICES BY MUSIC TRAINING CATEGORIES I	II	III	IV	V	TOTAL FIRST CHOICES
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS						
1	2	1	3	1	2	9
2	1	2	1	1	-	5
3	4	5	-	-	3	12
4	1	-	1	-	-	2
8	-	2	-	-	1	3
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS						
Pervading Characteristics						
15	-	-	-	-	1	1
30	-	2	-	-	1	3
Totals	-	2	-	-	2	4
Significant Characteristics						
10	-	-	2	-	1	3
13	-	-	-	1	-	1
14	-	-	-	-	2	2
18	-	-	1	-	-	1
26	1	-	-	-	-	1
34	-	-	-	-	1	1
Totals	1	-	3	1	4	9

TABLE 4G-8 (continued)

	FIRST CHOICES BY MUSIC TRAINING CATEGORIES					TOTAL FIRST CHOICES
CHARACTERISTIC NO.	I	II	III	IV	V	
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS (continued)						
Peripheral Characteristics						
21	-	2	-	-	1	3
31	-	1	-	-	-	1
Totals	-	3	-	-	1	4
Characteristics not related						
9	-	1	-	1	1	3
12	-	-	-	-	1	1
23	-	-	-	-	1	1
37	-	1	-	-	-	1
Totals	-	2	-	1	3	6
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES						
Mood Characteristics	8	10	5	2	6	31
% of total	(66.7)	(50.0)	(41.7)	(25.0)	(35.3)	(44.9)
Music Characteristics	1	7	3	2	10	23
% of total	(8.3)	(35.0)	(25.0)	(25.0)	(58.8)	(33.3)
No. of no responses	3	3	4	4	1	15
% of total	(25.0)	(15.0)	(33.3)	(50.0)	(5.9)	(21.8)

TABLE 4G-9

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 9 Fourth Concert
Overall Summary

	FIRST CHOICES BY MUSIC TRAINING CATEGORIES					TOTAL FIRST CHOICES
CHARACTERISTIC NO.	I	II	III	IV	V	
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS						
1	-	1	-	-	-	1
4	-	-	-	-	1	1
5	4	-	-	-	-	4
6	1	1	1	-	-	3
7	1	4	2	1	1	9
8	-	1	-	-	-	1
Totals	6	7	3	1	2	19

TABLE 4G-9 (continued)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	FIRST CHOICES BY MUSIC TRAINING CATEGORIES I	II	III	IV	V	TOTAL FIRST CHOICES
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS						
Pervading Characteristics						
13	-	-	-	1	1	2
18	-	1	-	-	-	1
26	-	1	-	-	-	1
30	-	-	-	-	1	1
Totals	-	2	-	1	2	5
Significant Characteristics						
34	-	1	3	-	2	6
Totals	-	1	3	-	2	6
Peripheral Characteristics						
14	-	1	1	-	1	3
Totals	-	1	1	-	1	3
Characteristics not related						
9	1	-	1	-	1	3
20	-	-	-	-	1	1
21	-	1	-	-	-	1
22	-	1	-	-	-	1
25	-	-	-	1	1	2
31	-	1	-	-	1	2
33	-	1	-	-	2	3
35	-	-	-	1	-	1
36	-	2	1	-	3	6
Totals	1	6	2	2	9	20
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES						
Mood Characteristics	6	7	3	1	2	19
% of total	(50.0)	(35.0)	(25.0)	(12.5)	(11.8)	(27.5)
Music Characteristics	1	10	6	3	14	34
% of total	(8.3)	(50.0)	(50.0)	(37.5)	(82.3)	(49.3)
No. of no responses	5	3	3	4	1	16
% of total	(41.7)	(15.3)	(25.0)	(50.0)	(5.9)	(23.2)

Table 4G-10 lists the responses to the Index of Stylistic Characteristics for Composition # 10 (George - Laughing Song). Here the emphasis was placed more on the mood characteristics as evidenced by the fact that forty-nine percent of the auditors selected mood characteristics. Of the four selected, two stood out as being most significant. They were "bright, cheerful, gay" (6) and "humorous, light, graceful" (5). Thirty-six percent of the auditors selected music characteristics. Ten were selected with one, "interweaving of melodies, contrapuntal" (21) being most significant.

Responses to mood and music characteristics were evenly divided in the case of the first Gaburo composition, Composition # 11 (Snow). Forty-two percent of the auditors selected mood characteristics, while forty-one percent selected music characteristics. Six mood characteristics were selected at least twice, but only one stood out as being significant, "quiet, lyrical, satisfying, calm" (4). Choices were scattered among fourteen music characteristics, with only one being mentioned with any degree of frequency, namely, "interweaving of melodies, contrapuntal" (21). (See Table 4G-11.)

The reaction to the obvious change in the musical style of Gaburo was evident in the responses to Composition # 12 (Gaburo - The cry). Only twenty-three percent selected mood characteristics while twice as many, forty-six percent, selected music characteristics. This tends to point up the problem that auditors had in associating mood with the less traditional works. For all eight mood characteristics were selected at least once, with no consistency of mood being apparent. Twelve music characteristics were selected at least once with one, "interweaving of melodies, contrapuntal" (21), being selected frequently enough to be considered significant. "Dissonant sounds" (14) was selected only five times. (See Table 4G-12.)

Even less emphasis on mood was apparent in the responses to the third work by Gaburo, Composition # 13 (Terra tremuit). Only nineteen percent of the auditors selected five mood characteristics, with one being selected more frequently than the others, namely, "spiritual, serious, inspiring" (1). However, it was not selected often enough to really be considered significant. Ten music characteristics were selected by sixty-two percent of the auditors. "Dissonant sounds" (14) was mentioned a significant number of times (especially by Music Training Category III) and "sounds like atonal music" (20) was emphasized, primarily by those in Music Training Categories II and V. (See Table 4G-13.)

TABLE 4G-10

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 10 Fourth Concert
Overall Summary

	FIRST CHOICES BY MUSIC TRAINING CATEGORIES					TOTAL FIRST CHOICES
CHARACTERISTIC NO.	I	II	III	IV	V	
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS						
4	1	-	2	-	-	3
5	4	1	3	1	1	10
6	2	8	4	1	4	19
7	1	1	-	-	-	2
Totals	8	10	9	2	5	34
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS						
Pervading Characteristics						
15	-	-	-	1	1	2
18	-	1	-	-	-	1
30	-	1	-	-	1	2
36	1	-	-	1	1	3
Totals	1	2	-	2	3	8
Significant Characteristics						
33	-	-	-	-	1	1
Totals	-	-	-	-	1	1
Peripheral Characteristics						
21	1	3	1	-	4	9
Totals	1	3	1	-	4	9

TABLE 4G-10 (continued)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	FIRST CHOICES BY MUSIC TRAINING CATEGORIES I	II	III	IV	V	TOTAL FIRST CHOICES
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS (continued)						
Characteristics not related						
14	-	-	-	-	1	1
24	-	1	-	-	-	1
25	-	1	-	-	2	3
34	1	1	-	-	-	2
Totals	1	3	-	-	3	7
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES						
Mood Characteristics	8	10	9	2	5	34
% of total	(66.7)	(50.0)	(75.0)	(25.0)	(29.4)	(49.3)
Music Characteristics	3	8	1	2	11	25
% of total	(25.0)	(40.0)	(8.3)	(25.0)	(64.7)	(36.2)
No. of no responses	1	2	2	4	1	10
% of total	(8.3)	(10.0)	(16.7)	(50.0)	(5.9)	(14.5)

TABLE 4G-11

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 11 Fourth Concert
Overall Summary

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	FIRST CHOICES BY MUSIC TRAINING CATEGORIES I	II	III	IV	V	TOTAL FIRST CHOICES
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS						
1	1	-	1	1	-	3
2	-	3	-	-	-	3
3	1	1	1	1	-	4
4	6	4	3	1	1	15
5	-	1	-	-	1	2
7	1	1	-	-	-	2
Totals	9	10	5	3	2	29

TABLE 4G-11 (continued)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	FIRST CHOICES BY MUSIC TRAINING CATEGORIES I	II	III	IV	V	TOTAL FIRST CHOICES
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS						
Pervading Characteristics						
15	-	-	-	-	1	1
18	-	2	-	-	-	2
21	-	4	-	-	3	7
30	-	-	1	-	2	3
Totals	-	6	1	-	6	13
Significant Characteristics						
10	-	-	2	-	-	2
11	-	-	1	-	-	1
13	-	1	-	-	1	2
26	-	-	-	-	1	1
Totals	-	1	3	-	2	6
Peripheral Characteristics						
14	-	1	-	-	1	2
25	-	-	-	1	-	1
Totals	-	1	-	1	1	3
Characteristics not related						
19	-	-	-	-	1	1
24	-	-	-	-	2	2
34	1	-	-	-	1	2
36	-	1	-	-	-	1
Totals	1	1	-	-	4	6
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES						
Mood Characteristics	9	10	5	3	2	29
% of total	(75.0)	(50.0)	(41.7)	(37.5)	(11.8)	(42.0)
Music Characteristics	1	9	4	1	13	28
% of total	(8.3)	(45.0)	(33.3)	(12.5)	(76.4)	(40.6)
No. of no responses	2	1	3	4	2	12
% of total	(16.7)	(5.0)	(25.0)	(50.0)	(11.8)	(17.4)

TABLE 4G-12

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 12 Fourth Concert
Overall Summary

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	FIRST CHOICES BY MUSIC TRAINING CATEGORIES I	II	III	IV	V	TOTAL FIRST CHOICES
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS						
1	3	-	1	-	-	4
2	-	-	1	-	-	1
3	-	2	-	-	1	3
4	-	2	-	-	-	2
5	-	1	1	-	-	2
6	1	-	-	-	-	1
7	1	-	-	-	1	2
8	-	-	-	-	1	1
Totals	5	5	3	-	3	16
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS						
Pervading Characteristics						
15	-	-	-	-	1	1
30	-	-	-	-	1	1
Totals	-	-	-	-	2	2
Significant Characteristics						
21	1	5	1	1	4	12
31	-	-	1	-	1	2
Totals	1	5	2	1	5	14
Peripheral Characteristics						
11	-	1	-	-	-	1
14	-	2	2	-	1	5
25	-	1	-	1	1	3
34	-	-	1	-	-	1
Totals	-	4	3	1	2	10

TABLE 4G-12 (continued)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	FIRST CHOICES BY MUSIC TRAINING CATEGORIES I	II	III	IV	V	TOTAL FIRST CHOICES
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS (continued)						
Characteristics not related						
9	-	-	1	1	-	2
19	-	1	-	-	-	1
20	-	-	-	-	2	2
33	-	-	-	1	-	1
Totals	-	1	1	2	2	6
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES						
Mood Characteristics	5	5	3	-	3	16
% of total	(41.7)	(25.0)	(25.0)	(00.0)	(17.6)	(23.2)
Music Characteristics	1	10	6	4	11	32
% of total	(8.3)	(50.0)	(50.0)	(50.0)	(64.8)	(46.4)
No. of no responses	6	5	3	4	3	21
% of total	(50.0)	(25.0)	(25.0)	(50.0)	(17.6)	(30.4)

TABLE 4G-13

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 13 Fourth Concert
Overall Summary

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	FIRST CHOICES BY MUSIC TRAINING CATEGORIES I	II	III	IV	V	TOTAL FIRST CHOICES
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS						
1	3	1	1	-	2	7
2	1	-	-	-	1	2
3	1	-	-	-	-	1
4	1	1	-	-	-	2
7	1	-	-	-	-	1
Totals	7	2	1	-	3	13

TABLE 4G-13 (continued)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	FIRST CHOICES BY MUSIC TRAINING CATEGORIES					TOTAL FIRST CHOICES
	I	II	III	IV	V	
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS						
Pervading Characteristics						
9	1	2	2	-	1	6
20	-	4	-	1	4	9
21	-	2	-	-	1	3
30	1	-	-	-	1	2
Totals	2	8	2	1	7	20
Significant Characteristics						
14	1	2	5	1	3	12
Totals	1	2	5	1	3	12
Peripheral Characteristics						
NONE						
Characteristics not related						
10	-	1	1	-	-	2
13	-	1	1	-	-	2
19	-	1	1	2	1	5
23	-	-	-	-	1	1
36	-	1	-	-	-	1
Totals	-	4	3	2	2	11
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES						
Mood Characteristics	7	2	1	-	3	13
% of total	(58.3)	(10.0)	(8.3)	(00.0)	(17.6)	(18.8)
Music Characteristics	3	14	10	4	12	43
% of total	(25.0)	(70.0)	(83.4)	(50.0)	(70.6)	(62.4)
No. of no responses	2	4	1	4	2	13
% of total	(16.7)	(20.0)	(8.3)	(50.0)	(11.8)	(18.8)

Composition # 14 (Whikehart - Love of God) was the work most favorably received by the auditors in terms of preference responses. It was very consonant and traditional in style. That the auditors agreed with this styles summary was evident in their selection of the stylistic characteristics relating to the composition. Fifty-nine percent of the auditors selected mood characteristics. Four different mood characteristics were selected; however, one mood characteristic, "spiritual, serious, inspiring" (1), was selected much more frequently than the other three. Hence it would be considered the most significant mood characteristic from the standpoint of the auditors. Twenty-five percent of the auditors selected eight different music characteristics. However, no single characteristic was selected with enough frequency to be considered significant. (See Table 4G-14.)

Table 4G-15 lists the responses to the Index of Stylistic Characteristics for Composition # 15 (Stravinsky - Kyrie). For this work the emphasis tended to be directed more towards the music characteristics, with forty-three percent of the auditors selecting music characteristics as a first choice. Fourteen music characteristics were selected at least once, with "dissonant sounds" (14) being selected frequently enough to be considered significant. Four mood characteristics were selected by twenty-eight percent of the auditors. One, "spiritual, serious, inspiring" (1) was mentioned most often. It was the most significant mood characteristic as determined by the auditors.

The second excerpt from the Stravinsky Mass, Composition # 16 (Agnus Dei) received a slightly greater emphasis towards mood characteristics. Thirty-five percent of the auditors selected mood characteristics while thirty-eight percent selected music characteristics. (Twenty-seven percent did not make a choice.) Again the mood characteristic "spiritual, serious, inspiring" (1) was most significant. The music characteristic "dissonant sounds" (14) also was significant. Nine other music characteristics were selected at least once. (See Table 4G-16.)

The first of the three Ogdon works, Composition # 17 (A clear midnight), as indicated by the auditors' responses, emphasized music characteristics. Forty-nine percent of the auditors selected music characteristics, with "dissonant sounds" (14) being selected most frequently. A total of eleven music characteristics were selected at least once. There was very little agreement among the auditors as to the affective mood. Twenty-three percent selected four mood characteristics. "Quiet, lyrical, satisfying, calm" (4) was selected more frequently than the others. (See Table 4G-17.)

TABLE 4G-14

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 14 Fourth Concert
Overall Summary

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	FIRST CHOICES BY MUSIC TRAINING CATEGORIES I	II	III	IV	V	TOTAL FIRST CHOICES
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS						
1	4	8	5	2	6	25
4	2	1	2	-	2	7
7	1	2	1	1	-	5
8	1	2	1	-	-	4
Totals	8	13	9	3	8	41
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS						
Pervading Characteristics						
12	-	-	1	1	1	3
15	-	1	1	-	1	3
30	1	2	-	-	1	4
Totals	1	3	2	1	3	10
Significant Characteristics						
31	-	2	-	-	-	2
Totals	-	2	-	-	-	2
Peripheral Characteristics						
21	-	-	-	-	1	1
Totals	-	-	-	-	1	1

TABLE 4G-14 (continued)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	FIRST CHOICES BY MUSIC TRAINING CATEGORIES I	II	III	IV	V	TOTAL FIRST CHOICES
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS (continued)						
Characteristics not related						
17	-	-	-	-	1	1
22	-	2	-	-	-	2
23	-	-	-	-	1	1
Totals	-	2	-	-	2	4
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES						
Mood Characteristics	8	13	9	3	8	41
% of total	(66.7)	(65.0)	(75.0)	(37.5)	(47.1)	(59.4)
Music Characteristics	1	7	2	1	6	17
% of total	(8.3)	(35.0)	(16.7)	(12.5)	(35.3)	(24.6)
No. of no responses	3	-	1	4	3	11
% of total	(25.0)	(00.0)	(8.3)	(50.0)	(17.6)	(16.0)

TABLE 4G-15

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 15 Fourth Concert
Overall Summary

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	FIRST CHOICES BY MUSIC TRAINING CATEGORIES I	II	III	IV	V	TOTAL FIRST CHOICES
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS						
1	3	7	-	-	2	12
2	-	-	1	-	-	1
3	1	-	-	-	1	2
4	2	-	1	-	1	4
Totals	6	7	2	-	4	19

TABLE 4G-15 (continued)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	FIRST CHOICES BY MUSIC TRAINING CATEGORIES I	II	III	IV	V	TOTAL FIRST CHOICES
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS						
Pervading Characteristics						
11	-	1	-	-	-	1
12	-	-	-	-	1	1
30	-	1	1	-	1	3
35	-	-	-	-	1	1
Totals	-	2	1	-	3	6
Significant Characteristics						
9	1	-	-	-	-	1
13	-	-	-	1	-	1
21	-	1	1	-	1	3
34	-	-	-	-	1	1
Totals	1	1	1	1	2	6
Peripheral Characteristics						
14	-	1	3	2	3	9
Totals	-	1	3	2	3	9
Characteristics not related						
17	-	-	1	-	-	1
20	-	1	-	1	2	4
28	1	-	-	-	-	1
36	-	-	-	-	1	1
37	1	1	-	-	-	2
Totals	2	2	1	1	3	9
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES						
Mood Characteristics	6	7	2	-	4	19
% of total	(50.0)	(35.0)	(16.7)	(00.0)	(23.5)	(27.5)
Music Characteristics	3	6	6	4	11	30
% of total	(25.0)	(30.0)	(50.0)	(50.0)	(64.7)	(43.5)
No. of no responses	3	7	4	4	2	20
% of total	(25.0)	(35.0)	(33.3)	(50.0)	(11.8)	(29.0)

TABLE 4G-16

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 16 Fourth Concert
Overall Summary

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	FIRST CHOICES BY MUSIC TRAINING CATEGORIES					TOTAL FIRST CHOICES
	I	II	III	IV	V	
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS						
1	6	7	1	-	4	18
2	-	2	1	-	-	3
3	-	-	-	1	-	1
4	1	-	1	-	-	2
Totals	7	9	3	1	4	24
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS						
Pervading Characteristics						
10	-	-	1	-	-	1
13	-	1	-	1	-	2
21	-	1	2	-	1	4
30	-	1	-	-	1	2
Totals	-	3	3	1	2	9
Significant Characteristics						
NONE						
Peripheral Characteristics						
12	-	-	-	-	1	1
14	1	2	3	-	4	10
Totals	1	2	3	-	5	11
Characteristics not related						
11	-	1	-	-	-	1
20	-	-	-	1	2	3
34	-	-	-	-	1	1
36	-	-	-	-	1	1
Totals	-	1	-	1	4	6

TABLE 4G-16 (continued)

	FIRST CHOICES BY MUSIC TRAINING CATEGORIES					TOTAL FIRST CHOICES
CHARACTERISTIC NO.	I	II	III	IV	V	
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES						
Mood Characteristics	7	9	3	1	4	24
% of total	(58.4)	(45.0)	(25.0)	(12.5)	(23.5)	(34.8)
Music Characteristics	1	6	6	2	11	26
% of total	(8.3)	(30.0)	(50.0)	(25.0)	(64.7)	(37.7)
No. of no responses	4	5	3	5	2	19
% of total	(33.3)	(25.0)	(25.0)	(62.5)	(11.8)	(27.5)

TABLE 4G-17

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 17 Fourth Concert
Overall Summary

	FIRST CHOICES BY MUSIC TRAINING CATEGORIES					TOTAL FIRST CHOICES
CHARACTERISTIC NO.	I	II	III	IV	V	
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS						
2	1	2	-	-	1	4
3	1	-	-	-	1	2
4	3	2	1	-	3	9
7	-	-	1	-	-	1
Totals	5	4	2	-	5	16
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS						
Pervading Characteristics						
9	-	1	2	1	1	5
13	-	-	-	1	1	2
26	-	1	-	-	-	1
30	-	-	-	-	1	1
Totals	-	2	2	2	3	9
Significant Characteristics						
NONE						

TABLE 4G-17 (continued)

	FIRST CHOICES BY MUSIC TRAINING CATEGORIES					TOTAL FIRST CHOICES
CHARACTERISTIC NO.	I	II	III	IV	V	
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS (continued)						
Peripheral Characteristics						
14	1	5	3	1	3	13
16	-	-	-	-	1	1
Totals	1	5	3	1	4	14
Characteristics not related						
10	1	1	1	-	-	3
20	-	3	-	-	1	4
34	-	-	-	-	1	1
36	-	-	1	-	1	2
37	1	-	-	-	-	1
Totals	2	4	2	-	3	11
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES						
Mood Characteristics	5	4	2	-	5	16
% of total	(41.7)	(20.0)	(16.7)	(00.0)	(29.4)	(23.2)
Music Characteristics	3	11	7	3	10	34
% of total	(25.0)	(55.0)	(58.3)	(37.5)	(58.8)	(49.3)
No. of no responses	4	5	3	5	2	19
% of total	(33.3)	(25.0)	(25.0)	(62.5)	(11.8)	(27.5)

For Composition # 18, the second work by Ogdon, (Madrigal) the auditors selected mood characteristics much in the same way they had for his first composition. Of the six mood characteristics selected at least once by twenty-eight percent of the auditors, "quiet, lyrical, satisfying, calm" (4) was the most significant. The responses of thirty-five percent of the auditors were somewhat scattered between twelve music characteristics with none being mentioned frequently enough to be considered significant. Thirty-seven percent of the auditors did not select a stylistic characteristic. (See Table 4G-18.)

The emphasis on mood characteristics changed little in the responses to Composition # 19 (Last invocation), the third work of Ogdon's which was performed. Twenty-six percent of the auditors selected five mood characteristics, with their selections being scattered rather evenly among four of the mood characteristics. None was significant. Of the thirteen music characteristics selected by forty-eight percent of the auditors, only one, "voice/choral color" (30) was considered significant. (See Table 4G-19.)

The only work which utilized the rhythmic spoken word exclusively, Composition # 20 (Toch - Geographical Fugue), elicited a rather diverse selection of characteristics from the auditors. Fifty-four percent of the auditors selected twelve music characteristics. Seven of the music characteristics, all of those which were determined to be pervading or significant by the styles analysts, were mentioned with about the same degree of frequency. This was the only composition where this occurred, namely, a tendency for an equal emphasis on all of those characteristics which were judged to be pervading or significant characteristics of the work. The mood characteristic "humorous, light, graceful" (5) was selected frequently enough to be considered of a limited significance. Twenty-two percent of the auditors selected five different mood characteristics. (See Table 4G-20.)

Only seventy-one percent of the auditors selected a stylistic characteristic for the last composition, Composition " 21 (Rochberg - Psalm 23). Thirty-nine percent selected mood characteristics and thirty-two percent selected music characteristics. There was considerable agreement among those selecting mood characteristics, with "spiritual, serious, inspiring" (1) being selected with a relatively high degree of frequency. The music characteristic responses were rather widely scattered among nine different characteristics, none of which was listed with enough frequency to be considered significant.

TABLE 4G-18

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 18 Fourth Concert
Overall Summary

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	FIRST CHOICES BY MUSIC TRAINING CATEGORIES I	II	III	IV	V	TOTAL FIRST CHOICES
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS						
1	1	-	-	-	-	1
2	-	1	-	-	-	1
3	1	-	-	-	2	3
4	2	4	3	-	1	10
5	2	-	-	1	-	3
6	-	-	-	-	1	1
Totals	6	5	3	1	4	19
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS						
Pervading Characteristics						
30	-	-	1	-	1	2
Totals	-	-	1	-	1	2
Significant Characteristics						
10	1	1	1	-	-	3
12	-	-	-	-	1	1
13	-	-	-	1	-	1
14	-	1	-	-	1	2
21	-	1	1	1	2	5
36	-	1	-	-	-	1
Totals	1	4	2	2	4	13
Peripheral Characteristics						
NONE						
Characteristics not related						
9	-	1	-	-	3	4
11	-	2	-	-	-	2
26	-	1	-	-	-	1
32	-	-	-	-	1	1
37	-	-	-	-	1	1
Totals	-	4	-	-	5	9

TABLE 4G-18 (continued)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	FIRST CHOICES BY MUSIC TRAINING CATEGORIES I	II	III	IV	V	TOTAL FIRST CHOICES
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES						
Mood Characteristics	6	5	3	1	4	19
% of total	(50.0)	(25.0)	(25.0)	(12.5)	(23.5)	(27.5)
Music Characteristics	1	8	3	2	10	24
% of total	(8.3)	(40.0)	(25.0)	(25.0)	(58.8)	(34.8)
No. of no responses	5	7	6	5	3	26
% of total	(41.7)	(35.0)	(50.0)	(62.5)	(17.7)	(37.7)

TABLE 4G-19

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 19 Fourth Concert
Overall Summary

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	FIRST CHOICES BY MUSIC TRAINING CATEGORIES I	II	III	IV	V	TOTAL FIRST CHOICES
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS						
1	-	1	-	-	-	1
2	-	3	1	1	1	6
3	1	-	2	-	-	3
4	1	-	1	-	1	3
7	1	1	2	-	1	5
Totals	3	5	6	1	3	18
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS						
Pervading Characteristics						
11	-	-	1	1	-	2
18	1	1	-	-	-	2
30	2	5	1	1	2	11
Totals	3	6	2	2	2	15
Significant Characteristics						
14	-	2	-	-	-	2
Totals	-	2	-	-	-	2

TABLE 4G-19 (continued)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	FIRST CHOICES BY MUSIC TRAINING CATEGORIES I	II	III	IV	V	TOTAL FIRST CHOICES
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS (continued)						
Peripheral Characteristics						
21	-	-	1	-	-	1
Totals	-	-	1	-	-	1
Characteristics not related						
9	-	-	-	-	1	1
10	1	-	-	-	-	1
19	-	1	-	-	-	1
20	-	-	-	-	2	2
23	-	-	-	-	2	2
27	-	2	-	-	1	3
31	-	-	-	1	2	3
36	1	-	-	-	1	2
Totals	2	3	-	1	9	15
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES						
Mood Characteristics	3	5	6	1	3	18
% of total	(25.0)	(25.0)	(50.0)	(12.5)	(17.6)	(26.1)
Music Characteristics	5	11	3	3	11	33
% of total	(41.7)	(55.0)	(25.0)	(37.5)	(64.8)	(47.8)
No. of no responses	4	4	3	4	3	18
% of total	(33.3)	(20.0)	(25.0)	(50.0)	(17.6)	(26.1)

TABLE 4G-20

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 20 Fourth Concert
Overall Summary

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	FIRST CHOICES BY MUSIC TRAINING CATEGORIES I	II	III	IV	V	TOTAL FIRST CHOICES
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS						
1	-	-	-	-	1	1
4	1	-	-	-	-	1
5	1	2	3	1	1	8
6	1	2	-	-	-	3
7	-	1	1	-	-	2
Totals	3	5	4	1	2	15
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS						
Pervading Characteristics						
11	-	1	1	-	2	4
18	1	1	2	-	-	4
21	-	2	1	-	2	5
27	-	2	-	-	1	3
30	2	1	1	1	-	5
36	-	2	-	1	3	6
Totals	3	9	5	2	8	27
Significant Characteristics						
36	3	-	-	-	1	4
Totals	3	-	-	-	1	4
Peripheral Characteristics						
NONE						
Characteristics not related						
16	-	2	-	-	-	2
19	-	-	1	-	-	1
25	-	-	-	-	1	1
32	-	-	-	-	1	1
33	-	1	-	-	-	1
Totals	-	3	1	-	2	6

TABLE 4G-20 (continued)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	FIRST CHOICES BY MUSIC TRAINING CATEGORIES I	II	III	IV	V	TOTAL FIRST CHOICES
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES						
Mood Characteristics	3	5	4	1	2	15
% of total	(25.0)	(25.0)	(33.3)	(12.5)	(11.8)	(21.7)
Music Characteristics	6	12	6	2	11	37
% of total	(50.0)	(60.0)	(50.0)	(25.0)	(64.7)	(53.6)
No. of no responses	3	3	2	5	4	17
% of total	(25.0)	(15.0)	(16.7)	(62.5)	(23.5)	(24.7)

TABLE 4G-21

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 21 Fourth Concert
Overall Summary

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	FIRST CHOICES BY MUSIC TRAINING CATEGORIES I	II	III	IV	V	TOTAL FIRST CHOICES
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS						
1	5	5	3	1	5	19
3	-	2	-	-	-	2
4	2	-	-	-	-	2
7	-	-	1	1	2	4
Totals	7	7	4	2	7	27
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS						
Pervading Characteristics						
15	-	-	-	1	-	1
30	-	-	1	-	1	2
Totals	-	-	1	1	1	3
Significant Characteristics						
14	-	1	-	-	2	3
21	-	2	1	-	3	6
31	-	1	-	-	-	1
Totals	-	4	1	-	5	10

TABLE 4G-21 (continued)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	FIRST CHOICES BY MUSIC TRAINING CATEGORY I	II	III	IV	V	TOTAL FIRST CHOICES
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS (continued)						
Peripheral Characteristics						
12	1	-	-	-	-	1
Totals	1	-	-	-	-	1
Characteristics not related						
9	1	-	2	-	-	3
11	-	1	-	-	-	1
20	-	1	1	1	1	4
Totals	1	2	3	1	1	8
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES						
Mood Characteristics	7	7	4	2	7	27
% of total	(58.3)	(35.0)	(33.3)	(25.0)	(41.2)	(39.1)
Music Characteristics	2	6	5	2	7	22
% of total	(16.7)	(30.0)	(41.7)	(25.0)	(41.2)	(31.9)
No. of no responses	3	7	3	4	3	20
% of total	(25.0)	(35.0)	(25.0)	(50.0)	(17.6)	(29.0)

The researcher had expected a greater emphasis to be placed on mood characteristics by the auditors as they listened to the choral compositions of the Fourth Concert. The combination of text and music would be expected to be more suggestive of an affective mood. But this was not the case. There was a definite tendency again to relate mood to traditional sounds, and in those choral works which were less traditional in style and sound, responses in terms of mood characteristics tended to be fewer and more scattered. Even the auditor with no formal music training tended to select music characteristics rather than mood characteristics although he still had the tendency to place greater emphasis on mood than did those auditors with varying amounts of formal music training.

That the auditors reacted readily to dissonance was evident in the number of times that "dissonant sounds" (14) was mentioned with a significant frequency. It was also noteworthy to observe the ability of the auditors to distinguish and to select as a significant characteristic the "interweaving of melodies, contrapuntal" (21) in those works which were polyphonic in style.

In general, the auditors tended to select characteristics which had been determined by the styles analysts as not related to the composition, more frequently in those works which were less traditional. This indicated a general lack of understanding of contemporary music styles on the part of a number of the auditors. And selection of characteristics which were not related to the compositions was not limited to those with little or no formal music training. The auditors with more extensive formal music training tended to select unrelated characteristics with about the same degree of frequency when responding to the less traditional works.

Fifth Concert

The fifth concert of the Exposition of Contemporary American Music was presented by the Cincinnati Symphony Orchestra, with Max Rudolf conducting.

A total of 517 questionnaires were distributed to the audience as they entered the hall. 241 questionnaires were returned at the end of the concert, of which 148 were completely filled out and usable in the study. This constituted a twenty-nine percent return of usable questionnaires.

Six compositions were performed at the concert. All were premiere performances. The compositions performed were:

1.	Tetrameron	Russell Smith
2.	Threnody for Strings	Robert Lombardo
3.	Variazions	George H. Crumb
4.	Zodiac	George Rochberg
5.	Three Pieces for Orchestra	Leo Kraft
6.	Samson Agonistes	Robert Starer

Analysis of the data in terms of the independent variable, Occupation. Table 5A indicates the distribution of the auditors forming the sample for the Fifth Concert in terms of their Occupation. An examination of the distribution pointed out that four groups were large enough to be of value in the statistical analysis of data. They were "elementary or high school teacher," "musician," "other professionals," and "college student." The other occupational groupings were too small to be of real value and are included for general information.

Tables 5A-1 through 5A-6 list the preference responses in terms of Occupation for each of the six compositions.

In only one composition was there significant difference in responses among the four larger Occupational groups. The responses to Composition # 3 (Crumb - Variazions) yielded an *F* score of 1.072, which was significant at the .500 level. (See Table 5A-3.) Here the negative mean response of those in the "musician" group was significantly lower than the responses of the auditors in the other three groups. This work used a variety of orchestral effects which included extensive use of percussion and the mandolin. It was probably the wide use of special effects that accounted for the overall negative mean response by musicians.

TABLE 5A

Occupations of Auditors - Fifth Concert

Occupation	Number
college professor	7
elementary or high school teacher	17
musician	17
other professionals	38
proprietor, manager	9
clerk, office worker	10
semi-skilled labor	1
college student	49
total	148

TABLE 5A-1

Preference Responses in Terms of Occupation
Composition # 1 Fifth Concert

F score - .330 - not significant

OCCUPATION	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
college professor	4	2	0	1	0	1.2857
elem./h.s.teacher	5	9	2	1	0	1.0588
musician	6	6	0	4	1	0.7059
other professionals	8	16	7	7	0	0.6579
proprietor, manager	5	1	3	0	0	1.2222
clerk, office worker	2	5	2	1	0	0.8000
semi-skilled labor	1	0	0	0	0	2.0000
college student	10	28	5	3	3	0.7959

TABLE 5A-2

Preference Responses in Terms of Occupation
Composition # 2 Fifth Concert

F score - .640 - not significant

OCCUPATION	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
college professor	2	3	2	0	0	1.0000
elem/h.s. teacher	4	3	4	5	1	0.2353
musician	5	2	2	6	2	0.1176
other professionals	2	13	10	13	0	0.1053
proprietor, manager	2	2	1	3	1	0.1111
clerk, office worker	3	5	1	1	0	1.0000
semi-skilled labor	0	1	0	0	0	1.0000
college student	7	18	12	12	0	0.4082

TABLE 5A-3

Preference Responses in Terms of Occupation
Composition # 3 Fifth Concert

F score - 1.072 - significant at the .500 level

OCCUPATION	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
college professor	3	2	1	1	0	1.0000
elem/h.s. teacher	4	6	3	2	2	0.4706
musician	2	6	2	1	6	-0.1765
other professionals	15	10	8	4	1	0.8947
proprietor, manager	2	3	2	2	0	0.5556
clerk, office worker	2	3	2	1	2	0.2000
semi-skilled labor	0	0	0	1	0	-1.0000
college student	20	16	5	6	2	0.9388

TABLE 5A-4

Preference Responses in Terms of Occupation
Composition # 4 Fifth Concert

F score - .517 - not significant

OCCUPATION	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
college professor	3	2	2	0	0	1.1429
elem./h.s. teacher	4	5	4	3	1	0.4705
musician	6	4	3	2	2	0.5882
other professionals	8	17	4	7	2	0.5789
proprietor, manager	2	1	4	1	1	0.2222
clerk, office worker	1	2	1	4	2	-0.4000
semi-skilled labor	0	1	0	0	0	1.0000
college student	12	14	10	10	3	0.4490

TABLE 5A-5

Preference Responses in Terms of Occupation
Composition # 5 Fifth Concert

F score - .894 - significant at the .500 level

OCCUPATION	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
college professor	4	3	0	0	0	1.5714
elem./h.s. teacher	4	4	6	3	0	0.5294
musician	3	6	2	5	1	0.2941
other professionals	7	13	11	5	2	0.4737
proprietor, manager	1	2	3	2	1	0.0000
clerk, office worker	3	2	2	3	0	0.5000
semi-skilled labor	1	0	0	0	0	2.0000
college student	6	15	14	6	8	0.1020

TABLE 5A-6

Preference Responses in Terms of Occupation
Composition # 6 Fifth Concert

F score - .589 - not significant

OCCUPATION	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
college professor	6	1	0	0	0	1.8571
elem/h.s. teacher	7	7	3	0	0	1.2353
musician	9	5	3	0	0	1.3529
other professionals	17	16	3	2	0	1.2632
proprietor, manager	4	2	0	2	1	0.6667
clerk, office worker	4	3	3	0	0	1.1000
semi-skilled labor	1	0	0	0	0	2.0000
college student	26	15	7	1	0	1.3469

Analysis of the data in terms of the independent variable, Age Level. Table 5B indicates the distribution of the auditors forming the sample for the Fifth Concert in terms of their Age Level. An examination of the distribution indicated that only the two oldest groups, "56 - 65," and "66 or over" were too small to be of value in the statistical analysis of the data. The data for these two groups were included for general information.

Tables 5B-1 through 5B-6 list the preference responses in terms of Age Level for each of the six compositions performed.

There was a limited significant difference in mean responses to the first five compositions. Composition # 1 (Smith - Tetrameron) had an F score of 1.228, which was significant at the .500 level. The low mean response of those in the "22 - 25" group provided the basis for the significant difference. (See Table 5B-1.) There was no appreciable difference in the mean responses of the other Age Level groups. (See Table 5B-1.)

The F score for Composition # 2 (Lombardo - Threnody) was 1.044, also significant at the .500 level. The negative mean response of the "22 - 25" age group as contrasted with the higher mean responses of most of the other larger age groups pointed out the significant difference. It was of interest to note the relatively high mean response of those in the "56 - 65" age group. Although the group was not large enough to be of real value statistically, its generally favorable responses did contribute somewhat to the statistical difference. And since this work was written for string orchestra, it would be logical to assume that the higher mean response did indicate the more favorable attitude that group had for strings. Also, a point worthy of consideration was the fact that the work was a "memorial" for the late President Kennedy, and would probably be of more import to the older age groupings. (See Table 5B-2.)

The responses to Composition # 3 (Crumb - Variazions) yielded an F score of 1.759, which was significant at the .750 level. Here the low mean responses of the "22 - 25" and "26 - 35" age groups were significantly different from the higher mean responses of the "21 or under," the "36 - 45," and the "46 - 55" age groups. The lower mean response of the "56 - 65" age group could also be noted. The distinguishing characteristic of this work was its extensive use of special effects, a fact which did not go unnoticed in the response to stylistic characteristics. Reactions to this stylistic practice were probably evident, especially in the reactions of the "26 - 35" age group. (See Table 5B-3.)

The difference in mean responses to Composition # 4 (Rochberg - Zodiac) was less obvious. Here the F score was .917, significant at the .500 level. The contrast between the low mean response of the "22 - 25" age group and the high mean response of the "36 - 45" age group provided the basis for the significant difference. (See Table 5B-4.)

For Composition # 5 (Kraft - Three Pieces) the significant difference was again based on the mean response of the "22 - 25" age group. The F score was .917, again significant at the .500 level. The negative mean responses of the "22 - 25" age group could readily be contrasted with the higher positive mean response of the "21 or under" age group. (See Table 5B-5.)

The responses to Composition # 6 (Starer - Samson Agonistes) were not significantly different. This work was the most traditional sounding of the six compositions. (See Table 5B-6.)

A pattern of responses was clearly evident in this analysis. The "22 - 25" age group tended to regularly react less favorably to the works performed than did the other age groups.

TABLE 5B

Age Levels of Auditors - Fifth Concert

Age Level	Number
21 or under	54
22 - 25	17
26 - 35	30
36 - 45	20
46 - 55	15
56 - 65	11
66 or over	1
total	148

TABLE 5B-1

Preference Responses in Terms of Age
Composition # 1 Fifth Concert

F score - 1.228 - significant at the .500 level

AGE GROUP	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
21 or under	15	25	6	5	3	0.8148
22 - 25	1	7	4	5	0	0.2353
26 - 35	10	14	2	4	0	1.0000
36 - 45	7	10	2	0	1	1.1000
46 - 55	2	9	3	1	0	0.8000
56 - 65	6	1	2	2	0	1.0000
66 or over	0	1	0	0	0	1.0000

TABLE 5B-2

Preference Responses in Terms of Age
Composition # 2 Fifth Concert

F score - 1.044 - significant at the .500 level

AGE GROUP	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
21 or under	8	22	11	13	0	0.4630
22 - 25	1	5	3	6	2	-0.1765
26 - 35	5	8	5	11	1	0.1667
36 - 45	5	4	5	5	1	0.3500
46 - 55	3	3	5	4	0	0.3333
56 - 65	3	4	3	1	0	0.8182
66 or over	0	1	0	0	0	1.0000

TABLE 5B-3

Preference Responses in Terms of Age
Composition # 3 Fifth Concert

F score - 1.759 - significant at the .750 level

AGE GROUP	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
21 or under	21	18	5	8	2	0.8889
22 - 25	4	6	1	1	5	0.1765
26 - 35	5	10	7	4	4	0.2667
36 - 45	12	3	2	2	1	1.1500
46 - 55	4	5	5	1	0	0.8000
56 - 65	2	4	2	2	1	0.3636
66 or over	0	0	1	0	0	0.0000

TABLE 5B-4

Preference Responses in Terms of Age
Composition # 4 Fifth Concert

F score - .917 - significant at the .500 level

AGE GROUP	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
21 or under	16	17	8	11	2	0.6296
22 - 25	3	3	6	3	2	0.1176
26 - 35	5	11	7	4	3	0.3667
36 - 45	7	8	2	1	2	0.8500
46 - 55	3	4	3	4	1	0.2667
56 - 65	2	2	2	4	1	0.0000
66 or over	0	1	0	0	0	1.0000

TABLE 5B-5

Preference Responses in Terms of Age
Composition # 5 Fifth Concert

F score - .917 - significant at the .500 level

AGE GROUP	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
21 or under	13	17	14	6	4	0.5370
22 - 25	2	5	4	1	5	-0.1176
26 - 35	5	9	8	6	2	0.3000
36 - 45	3	7	5	5	0	0.4000
46 - 55	2	5	3	5	0	0.2667
56 - 65	3	2	4	1	1	0.4545
66 or over	1	0	0	0	0	1.0000

TABLE 5B-6

Preference Responses in Terms of Age
Composition # 6 Fifth Concert

F score - .878 - not significant

AGE GROUP	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
21 or under	31	17	5	1	0	1.4444
22 - 25	9	4	4	0	0	1.2941
26 - 35	14	9	4	2	1	1.1000
36 - 45	9	9	1	1	0	1.3000
46 - 55	5	6	3	1	0	1.0000
56 - 65	6	4	1	0	0	1.4545
66 or over	0	0	1	0	0	0.0000

Analysis of the data in terms of the independent variable, Music Training. Table 5C indicates the distribution of the auditors forming the sample for the Fifth Concert in terms of their formal music training. For the first time the distribution of the auditors among the five categories was such that all five categories were not of significant value in the statistical analysis. The relatively small number of auditors in Categories IV and V restricts the significance of the findings for the independent variable, Music Training.

Tables 5C-1 through 5C-6 list the preference responses in terms of formal music training for each of the six compositions performed.

The most significant levels of difference occurred in the responses to the first three compositions. The F score for Composition # 1 (Smith - Tetrameron) was 2.116, which was significant at the .900 level. Here the mean responses again follow the pattern which was previously discussed in connection with the first four concerts. The mean responses of those in Categories IV and V provided the basis for the greatest significance. (See Table 5C-1.)

The F score for Composition # 2 (Lombardo - Threnody) was 1.178, significant at the .500 level. Here the highest mean response came from those in Category III, with the mean responses of Categories IV and V curving towards negative reactions. Again the significance must be viewed with caution. (See Table 5C-2.)

The responses to Composition # 3 (Crumb - Variazions) yielded an F score of 3.900, significant at the .995 level. Here the pattern of mean responses was somewhat different. The highest mean response came from those in Category II, with the mean responses for those in Categories III, IV and V being steadily lower. This difference must be considered significant in view of the fact that the responses of the "musicians" in the Occupation groupings followed a similar response pattern. The data strongly suggests that those with more extensive formal music training did not view the use of special orchestral effects with much favor. (See Table 5C-3.)

An F score of .957, significant at the .500 level, was obtained from the responses to Composition # 4 (Rochberg - Zodiac). The pattern of mean responses was somewhat distorted. The differences between the mean responses of those in the first three categories were small. Again the most significant differences occurred between the mean responses of those in Categories IV and V. This could be related to the fact that Rochberg had presented the opening lecture of the Exposition, an address which was received with much favorable comment by those with extensive formal music training. However, the level of significance for this composition was such that the differences must be viewed with considerable caution. (See Table 5C-4.)

The mean responses to Composition # 5 (Kraft - Three Pieces) and Composition # 6 (Starer - Samson Agonistes) were not statistically significant. (See Tables 5C-5 and 5C-6.)

TABLE 5C

Music Training of Auditors - Fifth Concert

MUSIC TRAINING CATEGORY	NUMBER
I	46
II	73
III	12
IV	7
V	10
total	148

TABLE 5C-1

Preference Responses in Terms of Music Training

Composition # 1 Fifth Concert

F score - 2.116 - significant at the .900 level

MUSIC TRAINING CATEGORY	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
I	8	27	7	4	0	0.8478
II	23	30	10	7	3	0.8630
III	5	4	1	2	0	1.0000
IV	3	4	0	0	0	1.4286
V	2	2	1	4	1	0.0000

TABLE 5C-2

Preference Responses in Terms of Music Training
Composition # 2 Fifth Concert

F score - 1.178 - significant at the .500 level

MUSIC TRAINING CATEGORY	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
I	6	17	10	12	1	0.3261
II	11	26	16	19	1	0.3699
III	5	2	2	3	0	0.7500
IV	2	1	1	3	0	0.2857
V	1	1	3	3	2	-0.4000

TABLE 5C-3

Preference Responses in Terms of Music Training
Composition # 3 Fifth Concert

F score - 3.900 - significant at the .995 level

MUSIC TRAINING CATEGORY	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
I	14	15	8	7	2	0.6957
II	29	23	9	8	4	0.8904
III	3	3	5	1	0	0.6667
IV	1	3	0	1	2	0.0000
V	1	2	1	1	5	-0.7000

TABLE 5C-4

Preference Responses in Terms of Music Training
Composition # 4 Fifth Concert

F score - .957 - significant at the .500 level

MUSIC TRAINING CATEGORY	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
I	7	19	6	7	7	0.2609
II	21	21	14	15	2	0.6027
III	2	3	5	2	0	0.4167
IV	2	1	0	3	1	0.0000
V	4	2	3	0	1	0.8000

TABLE 5C-5

Preference Responses in Terms of Music Training
Composition # 5 Fifth Concert

F score - .000 - not significant

MUSIC TRAINING CATEGORY	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
I	6	15	12	12	1	0.2826
II	15	22	23	6	7	0.4384
III	3	3	3	2	1	0.4167
IV	1	3	0	2	1	0.1429
V	4	2	0	2	2	0.4000

TABLE 5C-6

Preference Responses in Terms of Music Training
Composition # 6 Fifth Concert

F score - .325 - not significant

MUSIC TRAINING CATEGORY	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
I	20	17	5	4	0	1.1522
II	41	23	7	1	1	1.3973
III	6	3	3	0	0	1.2500
IV	4	2	1	0	0	1.4286
V	3	4	3	0	0	1.0000

Analysis of the data in terms of the independent variable, Educational Attainment. Table 5D indicates the distribution of the auditors forming the sample for the Fifth Concert in terms of Educational Attainment. The distribution among the various levels of Educational Attainment was more significant at this concert than at the first four. The distribution was such that all groups, except the first and last, "9th grade or less" and "received doctor's degree," were large enough to be considered of value in the analysis of the data.

Tables 5D-1 through 5D-6 list the preference responses in terms of Educational Attainment for each of the six compositions performed.

Although the responses to the first five compositions were different at various levels of significance, there were no patterns of difference which were clearly evident. The _F_ score for Composition # 1 (Smith - Tetrameron) was 1.391, which was significant at the .500 level. The low mean response of those in the "attended high school, didn't graduate" group differed significantly from the higher mean responses of those in the "high school graduate" and "received master's degree" groups. The difference was of limited statistical significance. (See Table 5D-1.)

The responses to Composition # 2 (Lombardo - Threnody) yielded an _F_ score of 4.286, which was significant at the .995 level. Here the negative mean responses of those in the "attended high school, didn't graduate" and "college graduate" groups differed significantly with the higher positive mean responses of those in the "high school graduate" and "attended college, didn't graduate" groups. The level of significance was high and the difference must be considered to be significant. The reason for the difference was not readily apparent. (See Table 5D-2.)

Composition # 3 (Crumb - Variazione) had an _F_ score of 1.430, which was significant at the .750 level. The high mean response of those in the "attended college, didn't graduate" differed significantly from the lower mean responses of those in the "high school graduate", "college graduate", and "received master's degree" groups. Again the reactions to the use of strange orchestral effects was apparent in the differences in mean responses. (See Table 5D-3.)

The _F_ score for Composition # 4 (Rochberg - Zodiac) was 1.068, significant at the .500 level. The low mean response of the "attended college, didn't graduate" group, in contrast to the somewhat higher mean responses of the other groups provided the basis for significant difference. The level of significance was low and the difference was not considered to be of real value. (See Table 5D-4.)

The responses to Composition # 5 (Kraft - Three Pieces) yielded an _F_ score of .917, significant at the .500 level. The differences in the mean responses of those in the five larger groups were not significantly differed. The statistical significance was based on the high mean response of those in the "received doctor's degree" group, and was of no real value because of the small number of auditors in this group. (See Table 5D-5.)

The differences in the mean responses of the various groups for Composition # 6 (Starer - Samson Agonistes) were not significant. (See Table 5C-6.)

TABLE 5D

Educational Attainment of Auditors - Fifth Concert

Educational Attainment	Number
ninth grade or less	1
att. h.s., didn't graduate	13
high school graduate	15
att. coll., didn't graduate	41
college graduate	46
received master's degree	25
received doctor's degree	7
total	148

TABLE 5D-1

Preference Responses in Terms of Educational Attainment
Composition # 1 Fifth Concert

F score - 1.391 - significant at the .750 level

EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
ninth grade or less	0	0	0	1	0	-1.0000
att.h.s.,didn't grad.	3	5	1	3	1	0.4615
high school graduate	6	5	3	1	0	1.0667
att.coll.,didn't grad.	9	24	4	2	2	0.8780
college graduate	11	19	8	7	1	0.6957
rec'd.master's deg.	11	10	2	2	0	1.2000
rec'd.doctor'd deg.	1	4	1	1	0	0.7143

TABLE 5D-2

Preference Responses in Terms of Educational Attainment
Composition # 2 Fifth Concert

F score = 4.286 - significant at the .995 level

EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
ninth grade or less	0	0	0	1	0	-1.0000
att.h.s.,didn't grad.	0	5	0	8	0	-0.2308
high school graduate	4	7	1	3	0	0.8000
att.coll,didn't grad.	10	14	12	5	0	0.7073
college graduate	4	7	10	23	2	-0.2609
rec'd.master's deg.	5	8	8	2	2	0.4800
rec'd.doctor's deg.	2	3	1	1	0	0.8571

TABLE 5D-3

Preference Responses in Terms of Educational Attainment
Composition # 3 Fifth Concert

F score - .1430 - significant at the .750 level

EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
ninth grade or less	0	0	0	1	0	-1.0000
att.h.s.,didn't grad.	4	6	1	0	2	0.7692
high school graduate	3	6	2	3	1	0.4667
att.coll.,didn't grad.	17	14	4	6	0	1.0244
college graduate	16	9	9	5	7	0.4783
rec'd.master's deg.	4	10	5	3	3	0.3600
rec'd.doctor's deg.	4	1	2	0	0	1.2857

TABLE 5D-4

Preference Responses in Terms of Educational Attainment
Composition # 4 Fifth Concert

F score - 1.068 - significant at the .500 level

EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
ninth grade or less	0	0	1	0	0	0.0000
att.h.s.,didn't grad.	4	4	1	4	1	0.5385
high school graduate	4	7	0	4	0	0.7333
att.coll.,didn't grad.	7	11	9	8	6	0.1220
college graduate	14	12	11	7	2	0.6304
rec'd.master's deg.	4	10	5	4	2	0.4000
rec'd.doctor's deg.	3	2	1	1	0	1.0000

TABLE 5D-5

Preference Responses in Terms of Educational Attainment
Composition # 5 Fifth Concert

F score - .917 - significant at the .500 level

EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
ninth grade or less	0	0	0	1	0	-1.0000
att. h.s.,didn't grad.	4	2	4	2	1	0.4615
high school graduate	4	5	3	2	1	0.6000
att.coll.,didn't grad.	5	14	11	6	5	0.1951
college graduate	7	15	12	8	4	0.2826
rec'd.master's deg.	7	5	7	5	1	0.4800
rec'd.doctor's deg.	2	4	1	0	0	1.1429

TABLE 5D-6

Preference Responses in Terms of Educational Attainment
Composition # 6 Fifth Concert

F score - .431 - not significant

EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
ninth grade or less	0	1	0	0	0	1.0000
att. h.s.,didn't grad.	7	4	1	1	0	1.3077
high school graduate	9	6	0	0	0	1.6000
att.coll.,didn't grad.	23	11	7	0	0	1.3902
college graduate	18	20	4	3	1	1.087
rec'd.master's deg.	13	5	7	0	0	1.2400
rec'd.doctor's deg.	4	2	0	1	0	0.9000

Analysis of the data in terms of the independent variable, Familiarity. Tables 5E-1 through 5E-6 list the preference responses to the Familiarity Scale for the six compositions of the Fifth Concert. In every case the distribution of responses was heavily skewed towards the unfamiliar. And, although in four of the compositions the resultant *F* scores were statistically significant, the significance was not considered of real value because of the very few auditors who expressed familiarity with the music performed.

Composition # 1 (Smith - Tetrameron), which elicited the largest number of "familiar" and "not sure" responses, had a *F* score of .000, which was not significant. (See Table 5E-1.)

For the remaining compositions there was no pattern of responses which would tend to indicate that a feeling of familiarity or even a response of "not sure" would be of any real value. Hence the primary observation which was made was that there was no evidence in the responses to the compositions performed at the Fifth Concert which indicated that Familiarity was a factor in the manner in which auditors tended to respond to the works.

TABLE 5E-1

Preference Responses in Terms of Familiarity
Composition # 1 Fifth Concert

F score - .000 - not significant

DEGREE OF FAMILIARITY	+2	*1	0	-1	-2	Mean
Familiar A (11)	3	5	1	2	0	0.8182
Not sure B (10)	2	6	2	0	0	1.0000
Unfamiliar C (127)	36	56	16	15	4	0.8268

TABLE 5E-2

Preference Responses in Terms of Familiarity
Composition # 2 Fifth Concert

F score - 4.073 - significant at the .975 level

DEGREE OF FAMILIARITY	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
Familiar A (5)	2	1	1	1	0	0.8000
Not sure B (13)	5	6	0	2	0	1.0769
Unfamiliar C (130)	18	40	31	37	4	0.2385

TABLE 5E-3

Preference Responses in Terms of Familiarity
Composition # 3 Fifth Concert

F score - 3.750 - significant at the .975 level

DEGREE OF FAMILIARITY	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
Familiar A (12)	3	3	0	0	6	-0.2500
Not sure B (5)	2	3	0	0	0	1.4000
Unfamiliar C (131)	43	40	23	18	7	0.7176

TABLE 5E-4

Preference Responses in Terms of Familiarity
Composition # 4 Fifth Concert

F score -.958 - significant at the .500 level

DEGREE OF FAMILIARITY	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
Familiar A (12)	4	3	1	3	1	0.5000
Not sure B (4)	2	1	1	0	0	1.2000
Unfamiliar C (132)	30	42	26	24	10	0.4394

TABLE 5E-5

Preference Responses in Terms of Familiarity
Composition # 5 Fifth Concert

F score - 2.829 - significant at the .900 level

DEGREE OF FAMILIARITY	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
Familiar A (6)	4	1	1	0	0	1.5000
Not sure B (4)	1	2	0	1	0	0.7500
Unfamiliar C (138)	24	42	37	23	12	0.3116

TABLE 5E-6

Preference Responses in Terms of Familiarity
Composition # 6 Fifth Concert

F score - .659 - not significant

DEGREE OF FAMILIARITY	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
Familiar A (9)	3	6	0	0	0	1.3333
Not sure B (8)	6	2	0	0	0	1.7500
Unfamiliar C (131)	65	41	19	5	1	1.1884

Analysis of the data in terms of preference responses. Table 5F indicates the summary of preference responses to each composition performed at the Fifth Concert. In general the responses to the various works tended to be significantly different. There was one notable exception, however.

A comparison of the responses to Composition # 2 (Lombardo - Threnody) and Composition # 5 (Kraft - Three Pieces) yielded a t score of .317, which was not significant. Therefore the responses to these two works were not significantly different. The mean preference responses to these two works were the lowest, indicating the auditors reacted to them less favorably than to the other four works. Stylistically they are not similar.

Stylistically the works which were more traditionally oriented were Composition # 1 (Smith - Tetrameron) and Composition # 6 (Starer - Samson Agonistes). A comparison of the responses to these two works yielded a t score of 3.925, which was significant at the .995 level, the highest level of significance.

The differences in responses between Composition # 1 and the other works were all statistically significant. The t scores were as follows: Between Composition # 1 and Composition # 2 (Lombardo - Threnody), 4.178, significant at the .995 level; between Composition # 1 and Composition # 3 (Crumb - Variazione), 1.390, significant at the .900 level; between Composition # 1 and Composition # 4 (Rochberg - Zodiac), 2.979, significant at the .995 level; between Composition # 1 and Composition # 5 (Kraft - Three Pieces), 3.763, significant at the .995 level.

Except as previously noted the differences in responses between Composition # 2 (Lombardo - Threnody) and the other works were all statistically significant. The t scores were as follows: Between Composition # 2 and Composition # 3 (Crumb - Variazione), 2.587, significant at the .990 level; between Composition # 2 and Composition # 4 (Rochberg - Zodiac), 1.066, significant at the .750 level; and between Composition # 2 and Composition # 6 (Starer - Samson Agonistes), 8.181, significant at the .995 level. Only between the Lombardo (# 2) and Rochberg (# 4) works was the significant difference limited.

Composition # 3 (Crumb - Variazione) differed significantly from the other works in terms of preference responses. The comparison of preference responses yielded the following t scores: Between Composition # 3 and Composition # 4 (Rochberg - Zodiac), 1.492, significant at the .900 level; between Composition # 3 and Composition # 5 (Kraft - Three Pieces), 2.239, significant at the .975 level; and between Composition # 3 and Composition # 6 (Starer - Samson Agonistes), 5.157, significant at the .995 level.

The difference between the responses to Composition # 4 (Rochberg - Zodiac) and Composition # 5 (Kraft - Three Pieces) was of limited significance. The t score was .734, which was significant at the .750 level, the lowest level of significance. Stylistically the two works were somewhat similar. Both featured a rather sparse orchestral texture with few doublings, considerable brass writing, much percussion, extreme registers, etc. The difference between the responses to Composition # 4 and Composition # 6 (Starer - Samson Agonistes) was more significant. The t score was 6.818, significant at the .995 level.

Stylistically Composition # 5 (Kraft - Three Pieces) and Composition # 6 (Starer - Samson Agonistes) were quite different, with the Starer work being much more traditional. The differences in responses was quite evident, the t score being 7.701, which was significant at the .995 level.

Again the pattern of responses indicated that the auditors reacted more favorably to the works which were more closely oriented towards the traditional sounds and styles. As the style of the composition deviated from the nineteenth century tradition, the tendency was for the auditors to react less favorably.

TABLE 5F

Summary of Preference Responses for each Composition
Fifth Concert

COMPOSITION	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean	Standard Deviation
1	21	67	19	17	4	0.8378	1.0400
2	25	47	32	40	4	0.3311	1.1200
3	48	46	23	18	13	0.6621	1.2800
4	36	46	28	27	11	0.4662	1.2400
5	29	45	38	24	12	0.3716	1.2000
6	74	49	19	5	1	1.2838	0.8600

Analysis of the responses to the Index of Stylistic Characteristics. The responses to the Index of Stylistic Characteristics were examined in relation to the stylistic analyses of the compositions performed. (See Appendix I for the complete stylistic analyses of the works performed at the Fifth Concert.)

Since the works performed at the Fifth Concert were extended works, the tendency of the auditors to select several characteristics was more evident. Again at least fifty percent of the auditors selected three characteristics as being present in each composition. Therefore the summaries of characteristics show the frequency of first, second, and third choices, as well as the total frequency of selection. The sum is an indication of the relative significance of selection. A first choice was weighted more heavily than a second or third choice. Hence the sum of weighted choices was the most appropriate means of determining the relative significance of each characteristic from the standpoint of the auditors.

Tables 5G-1 through 5G-6 contain the summary of responses for Composition # 1 (Smith - Tetrameron). (The overall summary is contained in Table 5G-1. The other tables list the summaries in terms of their selection by those in the various Music Training Categories.) As first choices, selection of mood and music characteristics were evenly divided with forty-five percent of the auditors selecting mood characteristics and forty-seven percent selecting music characteristics. However, in the selection of second and third choices the emphasis was heavily weighted toward music characteristics.

Seven mood characteristics were selected by the auditors with four being selected with the greatest frequency. The frequency of selection of the four mood characteristics was significant in each case. The four were, in order of frequency of selection:

4. quiet, lyrical, satisfying, calm
3. sentimental, tender, pleading
2. heavy, gloomy, pathetic
1. spiritual, serious, inspiring.

In a more extended work the possibility of a number of affective moods being apparent was quite feasible. Hence the selection of four mood characteristics as being significant was understandable.

28 music characteristics were selected at least once. Six music characteristics, all judged to be present in the work, were mentioned frequently enough to be considered significant. They were, in the order of frequency:

29. string instrument color
10. lyric melody
9. irregular melodic contour, disjointed (angular)
27. strange orchestral effects
18. orderliness of structure
14. dissonant sounds

The characteristic "lyric melody" (10) was considered by the styles analysts to be a pervading characteristic, while "irregular melodic contour, disjointed" (9) was deemed to be peripheral. Hence the relative emphasis placed on angular melody by the auditors suggests that there was a tendency to be more sensitive to this characteristic than to some of the others. This tendency has been noted rather consistently in the analysis of the works performed at the preceding four concerts.

Again the tendency for those with no or only limited formal music training to place greater emphasis on the mood characteristics was evident. However, at the same time, those auditors in the first two categories, who selected music characteristics, were able to distinguish the characteristics which were related to the composition.

TABLE 5G-1

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 1 Fifth Concert
Overall Summary

		CHOICES			
CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS					
1	11	5	-	16	43
2	15	4	-	19	53
3	14	6	1	21	55
4	21	5	2	28	75
6	2	-	-	2	6
7	4	5	2	11	24
8	-	1	1	2	3
Totals	67	26	6	99	259
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS					
Pervading Characteristics					
10	12	10	3	25	59
18	5	5	6	16	31
Totals	17	15	9	41	90
Significant Characteristics					
15	2	4	1	7	15
21	2	3	3	8	15
26	3	2	2	7	15
28	2	3	1	6	9
29	8	12	12	32	60
34	-	-	3	3	3
Totals	17	24	22	63	117

TABLE 5G-1 (continued)

		CHOICES			
CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS (continued)					
Peripheral Characteristics					
9	9	10	4	23	51
13	-	4	4	8	12
14	2	8	5	15	27
16	2	1	2	5	10
23	-	5	-	5	10
25	2	1	2	5	10
27	4	5	10	19	32
31	1	4	3	8	14
32	1	1	3	5	8
36	3	1	2	6	13
37	1	1	-	2	5
Totals	25	41	35	101	192
Characteristics not related					
11	5	3	1	9	22
12	-	1	-	1	2
17	2	4	2	8	16
19	2	1	5	8	13
20	-	1	-	1	2
22	-	-	1	1	1
24	-	1	1	2	3
33	-	1	-	1	2
35	2	2	5	9	15
Totals	11	14	15	40	76
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES					
Mood Characteristics	67	26	6	99	259
% of total	(45.3)	(17.6)	(4.1)	(22.3)	
Music Characteristics	70	94	81	245	479
% of total	(47.3)	(63.5)	(54.7)	(55.2)	
No. of no responses	11	28	61	100	150
% of total	(7.4)	(18.9)	(41.2)	(22.5)	

TABLE 5G-2

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 1 Fifth Concert
Auditors in Music Training Category I

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	CHOICES First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS					
1	3	3	-	6	15
2	5	1	-	6	16
3	4	1	-	5	13
4	8	1	-	9	25
7	2	2	1	5	11
8	-	-	1	1	1
Totals	22	8	2	32	81
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS					
Pervading Characteristics					
10	2	5	1	8	17
18	2	1	1	4	9
Totals	4	6	2	12	26
Significant Characteristics					
15	1	1	-	2	5
21	1	1	2	4	7
26	1	1	2	4	7
28	1	-	-	1	3
29	1	3	4	8	13
Totals	5	6	8	19	35
Peripheral Characteristics					
9	4	5	2	11	24
13	-	2	-	2	4
14	-	-	1	1	1
16	1	-	-	1	3
23	-	3	-	3	6
25	1	-	1	2	4
27	3	2	3	8	16
31	-	1	-	1	2
36	-	1	1	2	3
37	-	1	-	1	2
Totals	9	15	8	32	65

TABLE 5G-2 (continued)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS (continued)					
Characteristics not related					
17	-	1	-	1	2
19	1	-	2	3	5
24	-	1	-	1	2
35	1	-	-	1	3
Totals	2	2	2	6	12
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES					
Mood Characteristics	22	8	2	32	81
% of total	(47.8)	(17.4)	(4.3)	(23.2)	
Music Characteristics	20	29	20	69	138
% of total	(43.5)	(63.0)	(43.5)	(50.0)	
No. of no responses	4	9	24	37	54
% of total	(8.7)	(19.6)	(52.2)	(26.8)	

TABLE 5G-3

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 1 Fifth Concert
Auditors in Music Training Category II

		CHOICES			
CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS					
1	3	1	-	4	11
2	8	2	-	10	28
3	8	3	1	12	31
4	10	4	1	15	39
6	2	-	-	2	6
7	2	1	-	3	8
8	-	1	-	1	2
Totals	33	12	2	47	125

TABLE 5G-3 (continued)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS					
Pervading Characteristics					
10	8	4	2	14	34
18	2	3	3	8	18
Totals	10	7	5	22	52
Significant Characteristics					
15	-	1	1	2	3
21	1	1	-	2	5
26	1	1	-	2	5
28	1	3	-	4	9
29	3	7	6	16	29
34	-	-	2	2	2
Totals	6	13	9	28	53
Peripheral Characteristics					
9	3	5	2	10	21
13	-	1	4	5	6
14	2	5	3	10	19
16	-	1	1	2	3
23	-	1	-	1	2
25	-	1	1	2	3
27	1	3	6	10	15
31	1	2	1	4	8
32	1	1	1	3	6
36	3	-	1	4	10
37	1	-	-	1	3
Totals	12	20	20	52	96
Characteristics not related					
11	4	1	1	6	15
17	2	1	1	4	9
19	-	1	2	3	4
20	-	1	-	1	2
24	-	-	1	1	1
33	-	1	-	1	2
35	1	2	5	8	12
Totals	7	7	10	24	45

TABLE 5G-3 (continued)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES					
Mood Characteristics	33	12	2	47	125
% of total	(45.2)	(16.4)	(2.7)	(21.5)	
Music Characteristics	35	47	44	126	246
% of total	(47.9)	(64.4)	(60.3)	(57.5)	
No. of no responses	5	14	27	46	70
% of total	(6.9)	(19.2)	(37.0)	(21.0)	

TABLE 5G-4

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 1 Fifth Concert
Auditors in Music Training Category III

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	CHOICES Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS					
1	2	-	-	2	6
2	1	1	-	2	5
3	1	1	-	2	5
7	-	-	1	1	1
Totals	4	2	1	7	17
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS					
Pervading Characteristics					
18	-	-	1	1	1
Totals	-	-	1	1	1
Significant Characteristics					
21	-	-	1	1	1
28	-	-	1	1	1
29	2	1	2	5	10
Totals	2	1	4	7	12

TABLE 5G-4 (continued)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS (continued)					
Peripheral Characteristics					
9	1	-	-	1	3
13	-	1	-	1	2
14	-	2	-	2	4
16	1	-	-	1	3
23	-	1	-	1	2
31	-	-	1	1	1
Totals	2	4	1	7	15
Characteristics not related					
11	1	-	-	1	3
17	-	1	-	1	2
19	1	-	1	2	4
Totals	2	1	1	4	9
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES					
Mood Characteristics	4	2	1	7	17
% of total	(33.3)	(16.7)	(8.3)	(19.4)	
Music Characteristics	6	6	7	19	37
% of total	(50.0)	(50.0)	(58.3)	(52.8)	
No. of no responses	2	4	4	10	18
% of total	(16.6)	(33.3)	(33.4)	(27.8)	

TABLE 5G-5

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 1 Fifth Concert
Auditors in Music Training Category IV

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	CHOICES				
	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS					
1	2	1	-	3	8
4	2	-	1	3	7
7	-	1	-	1	2
Totals	4	2	1	7	17

TABLE 5G-5 (continued)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	CHOICES				
	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS					
Pervading Characteristics					
10	1	1	-	2	5
18	-	1	1	2	3
Totals	1	2	1	4	8
Significant Characteristics					
15	-	1	-	1	2
26	1	-	-	1	3
29	1	1	-	2	5
34	-	-	1	1	1
Totals	2	2	1	5	11
Peripheral Characteristics					
14	-	-	1	1	1
32	-	-	1	1	1
Totals	-	-	2	2	2
Characteristics not related					
11	-	1	-	1	2
Totals	-	1	-	1	2
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES					
Mood Characteristics	4	2	1	7	17
% of total	(57.1)	(28.6)	(14.3)	(33.3)	
Music Characteristics	3	5	4	12	23
% of total	(42.9)	(71.4)	(57.1)	(57.1)	
No. of no responses	-	-	2	2	2
% of total	(00.0)	(00.0)	(28.6)	(9.6)	

TABLE 5G-6

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 1 Fifth Concert
Auditors in Music Training Category V

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS					
1	1	-	-	1	3
2	1	-	-	1	3
3	1	1	-	2	5
4	1	-	-	1	3
7	-	1	-	1	2
Totals	4	2	-	6	16
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS					
Pervading Characteristics					
10	1	-	-	1	3
18	1	-	-	1	3
Totals	2	-	-	2	6
Significant Characteristics					
15	1	1	-	2	5
21	-	1	-	1	2
29	1	-	-	1	3
Totals	2	2	-	4	10
Peripheral Characteristics					
9	1	-	-	1	3
14	-	1	-	1	2
16	-	-	1	1	1
25	1	-	-	1	3
27	-	-	1	1	1
31	-	1	1	2	3
32	-	-	1	1	1
Totals	2	2	4	8	14
Characteristics not related					
11	-	1	-	1	2
12	-	1	-	1	2
17	-	1	1	2	3
22	-	-	1	1	1
Totals	-	3	2	5	8

TABLE 5G-6 (continued)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES					
Mood Characteristics	4	2	-	6	16
% of total	(40.0)	(20.0)	(00.0)	(20.0)	
Music Characteristics	6	7	6	19	38
% of total	(60.0)	(70.0)	(60.0)	(63.3)	
No. of no responses	0	1	4	5	6
% of total	(00.0)	(10.0)	(40.0)	(16.7)	

Tables 5G-7 through 5G-12 contain the summary of responses for Composition # 2 (Lombardo - Threnody). (The overall summary is contained in 5G-7, and the listings according to formal music training are found in the remaining tables.) It should be stated that the program notes for Composition # 2 specified that the mood of the composition was "sorrowful" and that it had been written as a memorial to the late President Kennedy. Therefore it was not unexpected when the auditors placed a greater emphasis on mood characteristics in selecting the first choices. The selection of characteristics as second and third choices followed the prevalent pattern, with the prime emphasis being placed on music characteristics.

Five mood characteristics were selected with four having a significant frequency of selection. They were, in the order of frequency:

2. heavy, gloomy, pathetic
3. sentimental, tender, pleading
1. spiritual, serious, inspiring
4. quiet, lytical, satisfying, calm.

The mood characteristic most closely associated with the "sorrowful" mood indicated in the program notes was "heavy, gloomy, pathetic." That this mood was selected as often as the other three combined, suggests that, while this was an appropriate response, the fact that the program notes specified a mood did have an effect upon the manner in which the auditors responded.

24 music characteristics were selected at least once. Of this number only five were selected with enough frequency to be considered significant. They were, in the order of frequency of selection:

29. string instrument color
10. lyric melody
9. irregular melodic contour, disjointed (angular)
21. interweaving of melodies (contrapuntal)
23. extreme pitch ranges (high-low) of the music.

Again "lyric melody" was adjudged to be a significant characteristic while "irregular melodic contour" was considered peripheral by the styles analysts. However, both were selected often enough to be considered significant, indicating an apparent sensitivity to the melodic aspects.

TABLE 5G-7

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 2 Fifth Concert
Overall Summary

	CHOICES				
CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS					
1	13	4	5	22	52
2	47	8	8	63	165
3	16	6	1	23	61
4	11	7	3	21	50
7	2	2	-	4	10
Totals	89	27	17	133	338
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS					
Pervading Characteristics					
18	1	4	4	9	15
21	3	7	4	14	27
29	12	8	14	34	66
Totals	16	19	23	57	108

TABLE 5G-7 (continued)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS (continued)					
Significant Characteristics					
10	5	14	5	24	48
14	6	3	1	10	25
15	1	2	2	5	9
26	1	5	7	13	20
35	-	3	3	6	9
Totals	13	27	18	58	111
Peripheral Characteristics					
9	6	7	4	17	36
13	3	3	3	9	18
16	-	2	1	3	5
20	1	1	3	5	8
23	3	6	6	15	27
25	1	4	2	7	13
37	-	4	2	6	10
Totals	14	27	21	62	117
Characteristics not related					
11	1	7	-	8	17
17	6	1	5	12	25
19	1	2	-	3	7
22	-	1	-	1	2
27	-	2	2	4	6
28	-	2	-	2	4
31	1	1	1	3	6
34	-	-	1	1	1
36	-	2	1	3	5
Totals	9	18	10	37	73
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES					
Mood Characteristics	89	27	17	133	338
% of total	(60.1)	(18.2)	(11.5)	(30.0)	
Music Characteristics	52	91	71	214	409
% of total	(35.1)	(61.5)	(48.0)	(48.2)	
No. of no responses	7	30	60	97	141
% of total	(4.8)	(20.3)	(40.5)	(21.8)	

TABLE 5G-8

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 2 Fifth Concert
Auditors in Music Training Category I

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	CHOICES First	 Second	 Third	 Total	 Sum
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS					
1	6	-	2	8	20
2	14	4	2	20	52
3	k0	2	1	13	35
4	2	4	3	9	17
7	1	1	-	2	5
Totals	33	11	8	52	129
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS					
Pervading Characteristics					
18	-	2	1	3	5
21	-	1	-	1	2
29	1	4	3	8	14
Totals	1	7	4	12	21
Significant Characteristics					
10	3	4	2	9	19
14	1	-	-	1	3
15	1	1	-	2	5
26	1	1	2	4	7
35	-	-	3	3	3
Totals	6	6	7	19	37
Peripheral Characteristics					
9	1	1	-	2	5
13	-	1	1	2	3
16	-	-	1	1	1
20	-	-	1	1	1
23	2	1	-	3	8
25	-	3	-	3	6
37	-	-	1	1	1
Totals	3	6	4	13	25

TABLE 5G-8 (continued)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS (continued)					
Characteristics not related					
11	-	1	-	1	2
17	1	1	1	3	6
19	-	1	-	1	2
22	-	1	-	1	2
27	-	-	1	1	1
31	-	1	-	1	2
36	-	1	1	2	3
Totals	1	6	3	10	18
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES					
Mood Characteristics	33	11	8	52	129
% of total	(71.7)	(23.9)	(17.4)	(37.7)	
Music Characteristics	11	25	18	54	101
% of total	(23.9)	(54.3)	(39.1)	(39.1)	
No. of no responses	2	10	20	32	46
% of total	(4.4)	(21.8)	(43.5)	(23.2)	

TABLE 5G-9

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 2 Fifth Concert
Auditors in Music Training Category II

		CHOICES			
CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS					
1	7	2	3	12	28
2	27	2	1	30	86
3	4	3	-	7	18
4	8	2	-	10	28
7	-	1	-	1	2
Totals	46	10	4	60	162

TABLE 5G-9 (continued)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS					
Pervading Characteristics					
18	1	1	3	5	8
21	1	3	2	6	11
29	6	4	7	17	33
Totals	8	8	12	28	52
Significant Characteristics					
10	1	6	2	9	17
14	4	3	-	7	18
15	-	1	1	2	3
26	-	3	4	7	10
35	-	2	-	2	4
Totals	5	15	7	27	52
Peripheral Characteristics					
9	1	4	3	8	14
13	2	1	1	4	9
16	-	2	-	2	4
20	1	1	1	3	6
23	-	5	6	11	16
25	1	-	2	3	5
37	-	3	1	4	7
Characteristics not related					
11	1	5	-	6	13
17	4	-	3	7	15
19	1	1	-	2	5
27	-	1	-	1	2
28	-	2	-	2	4
31	-	-	1	1	1
34	-	-	1	1	1
Totals	6	9	5	20	41

TABLE 5G-9 (continued)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES					
Mood Characteristics	46	10	4	60	162
% of total	(63.0)	(13.7)	(5.5)	(27.4)	
Music Characteristics	24	48	38	110	206
% of total	(32.9)	(65.8)	(52.1)	(50.2)	
No. of no responses	3	15	31	49	70
% of total	(4.1)	(20.5)	(42.4)	(22.4)	

TABLE 5G-10

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 2 Fifth Concert
Auditors in Music Training Category III

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	CHOICES Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS					
2	2	2	3	7	13
3	1	-	-	1	3
7	1	-	-	1	3
Totals	4	2	3	9	19
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS					
Pervading Characteristics					
21	1	1	-	2	5
29	3	-	1	4	10
Totals	4	1	1	6	15
Significant Characteristics					
10	-	-	1	1	1
14	-	-	1	1	1
26	-	1	-	1	2
Totals	-	1	2	3	4

TABLE 5G-10 (continued)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS (continued)					
Peripheral Characteristics					
9	2	2	-	4	10
13	-	1	1	2	3
20	-	-	1	1	1
23	1	-	-	1	3
37	-	1	-	1	2
Totals	3	4	2	9	19
Characteristics not related					
17	-	-	1	1	1
36	-	1	-	1	2
Totals	-	1	1	2	3
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES					
Mood Characteristics	4	2	3	9	19
% of total	(33.3)	(16.7)	(25.0)	(25.0)	
Music Characteristics	7	7	6	20	41
% of total	(58.3)	(58.3)	(50.0)	(55.6)	
No. of no responses	1	3	3	7	12
% of total	(8.4)	(25.0)	(25.0)	(19.4)	

TABLE 5G-11

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 2 Fifth Concert
Auditors in Music Training Category IV

	CHOICES				
CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS					
1	-	1	-	1	2
2	1	-	1	2	4
4	1	1	-	2	5
Totals	2	2	1	5	11

TABLE 5G-11 (continued)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS					
Pervading Characteristics					
21	1	2	-	3	7
29	2	-	-	2	6
Totals	3	2	-	5	13
Significant Characteristics					
10	-	1	-	1	2
26	-	-	1	1	1
Totals	-	1	1	2	3
Peripheral Characteristics					
13	1	-	-	1	3
Totals	1	-	-	1	3
Characteristics not related					
17	1	-	-	1	3
27	-	1	-	1	2
Totals	1	1	-	2	5
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES					
Mood Characteristics	2	2	1	5	11
% of total	(28.6)	(28.6)	(14.3)	(23.8)	
Music Characteristics	5	4	1	10	24
% of total	(71.4)	(57.1)	(14.3)	(47.6)	
No. of no responses	-	1	5	6	7
% of total	(00.0)	(14.3)	(71.4)	(28.6)	

TABLE 5G-12

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 2 Fifth Concert
Auditors in Music Training Category V

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	CHOICES First	 Second	 Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS					
1	-	1	-	1	2
2	3	-	1	4	10
3	1	1	-	2	5
Totals	4	2	1	7	17
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS					
Pervading Characteristics					
18	-	1	-	1	2
21	-	-	2	2	2
29	-	-	3	3	3
Totals	-	1	5	6	7
Significant Characteristics					
10	1	3	-	4	9
14	1	-	-	1	3
15	-	-	1	1	1
35	-	1	-	1	2
Totals	2	4	1	7	15
Peripheral Characteristics					
9	2	-	1	3	7
25	-	1	-	1	2
Totals	2	1	1	4	9
Characteristics not related					
11	-	1	-	1	2
27	-	-	1	1	1
31	1	-	-	1	3
Totals	1	1	1	3	6

TABLE 5G-12 (continued)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES					
Mood Characteristics	4	2	1	7	17
% of total	(40.0)	(20.0)	(10.0)	(23.3)	
Music Characteristics	5	7	8	20	37
% of total	(50.0)	(70.0)	(80.0)	(66.7)	
No. of no responses	1	1	1	3	6
% of total	(10.0)	(10.0)	(10.0)	(10.0)	

Tables 5G-13 through 5G-18 contain the summary of responses for Composition # 3 (Crumb - Varizsione). (The overall summary is contained in 5G-13, and the listings according to formal music training are found in the remaining tables.) In the responses to this work, the auditors consistently emphasized the music characteristics in their first, second, and third choices. While the emphasis was somewhat greater on mood characteristics in terms of first choices, the difference in the number of mood choices as second and third choices was not as great. Also there was a greater consistency in terms of the most significant mood characteristic. Only one mood was mentioned with enough frequency to be considered significant. It was "dramatic, agitated, exciting, triumphant" (7). All eight mood characteristics were selected at least twice.

24 music characteristics were selected at least once. Since this work was specifically a set of variations, one would expect a number of significant selections. However, such was not really the case. A total of six characteristics were selected with enough frequency to be considered significant. And there was a tendency to place greater emphasis on those which were considered significant. The six were, in the order of frequency:

27. strange orchestral effects
9. irregular melodic contour, disjointed (angular)
31. dynamic contrast of the music
25. cluttered texture, busy music
32. percussion color
14. dissonant sounds.

While not significant from the standpoint of the entire sample, those in Music Training Category I did select the music characteristic "extreme pitch ranges of the music" with a significant frequency. The preponderance of times (61) when "strange orchestral effects" (27) was mentioned, pointed up the importance with which the auditors viewed this characteristic of the music. It also added to the validity of using that characteristic of this work as a basis for reading meaning into the statistical differences of preference responses in terms of the various independent variables.

TABLE 5G-13

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 3 Fifth Concert
Overall Summary

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	CHOICES				
	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS					
1	2	1	1	4	9
2	1	1	-	2	5
3	2	1	-	3	8
4	1	2	-	3	7
5	3	3	3	9	18
6	5	1	4	10	21
7	24	12	10	46	106
8	2	2	5	9	15
Totals	40	23	23	86	189
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS					
Pervading Characteristics					
18	6	1	4	11	24
20	-	7	4	10	18
27	34	22	10	61	156
31	8	11	7	26	53
Totals	48	41	25	114	251

TABLE 5G-13 (continued)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS (continued)					
Significant Characteristics					
9	16	8	10	34	74
11	2	3	1	6	13
14	5	6	3	14	30
16	2	7	1	10	21
23	3	3	6	12	21
28	1	3	2	6	11
29	-	5	3	8	13
32	4	5	6	15	28
33	1	-	2	3	5
34	1	1	-	2	5
35	-	1	1	2	3
36	-	7	3	10	17
Totals	35	49	38	122	241
Peripheral Characteristics					
12	2	-	3	5	9
19	5	4	2	11	25
25	9	3	4	16	37
Totals	16	7	9	32	71
Characteristics not related					
10	1	-	1	2	4
13	-	2	2	4	6
17	-	4	1	5	9
21	1	2	1	4	8
24	1	1	2	4	7
Totals	3	9	7	19	34
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES					
Mood Characteristics	40	23	23	86	189
% of total	(27.0)	(15.5)	(15.5)	(19.4)	
Music Characteristics	102	106	79	287	597
% of total	(68.9)	(71.6)	(53.4)	(64.6)	
No. of no responses	6	19	46	71	102
% of total	(4.1)	(12.9)	(31.1)	(16.0)	

TABLE 5G-14

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 3 Fifth Concert
Auditors in Music Training Category I

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	CHOICES First	 Second	 Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS					
1	1	-	-	1	3
3	2	-	-	2	6
5	-	1	1	2	3
6	3	-	2	5	11
7	10	4	3	17	41
8	2	1	1	4	9
Totals	18	6	7	31	73
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS					
Pervading Characteristics					
18	2	-	1	3	7
20	-	2	-	2	4
27	7	5	3	15	34
31	2	1	2	5	10
Totals	11	8	6	25	55
Significant Characteristics					
9	5	3	1	9	22
11	-	1	-	1	2
14	-	2	1	3	5
16	1	3	1	5	10
23	2	2	4	8	14
28	-	1	-	1	2
29	-	3	1	4	7
32	3	3	2	8	17
33	1	-	1	2	4
35	-	1	-	1	2
36	-	3	-	3	6
Totals	12	22	11	45	91

TABLE 5G-14 (continued)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS (continued)					
Peripheral Characteristics					
12	1	-	1	2	4
19	2	1	1	4	9
25	-	1	2	3	4
Totals	3	2	4	9	17
Characteristics not related					
10	1	-	-	1	3
13	-	1	-	1	2
17	-	2	1	3	5
21	-	1	-	1	2
24	-	-	1	1	1
Totals	1	4	2	7	13
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES					
Mood Characteristics	18	6	7	31	73
% of total	(39.1)	(13.0)	(15.2)	(22.5)	
Music Characteristics	27	36	23	86	176
% of total	(58.7)	(78.3)	(50.0)	(62.3)	
No. of no-responses	1	4	16	21	27
% of total	(2.2)	(8.7)	(34.8)	(15.2)	

TABLE 5G-15

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 3 Fifth Concert
Auditors in Music Training Category II

	CHOICES				
CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS					
1	1	1	-	2	5
2	1	1	-	2	5
3	-	1	-	1	2
4	1	1	-	2	5
5	3	1	1	5	12
6	1	1	2	4	7
7	13	5	7	25	56
8	-	1	4	5	6
Totals	20	12	14	46	98
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS					
Pervading Characteristics					
18	4	-	2	6	14
20	-	1	3	4	5
27	13	12	5	30	68
31	5	8	3	16	34
Totals	22	21	13	56	121
Significant Characteristics					
9	7	4	3	14	32
11	2	2	1	5	11
14	2	2	2	6	12
16	-	3	-	3	6
23	1	1	1	3	6
28	1	2	2	5	9
29	-	2	2	4	6
32	1	1	3	5	8
33	-	-	1	1	1
34	1	1	-	2	5
36	-	3	2	5	8
Totals	15	21	17	53	104

TABLE 5G-15 (continued)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS (continued)					
Peripheral Characteristics					
12	1	-	2	3	5
19	1	3	-	4	9
25	8	1	2	11	28
Totals	10	4	4	18	42
Characteristics not related					
10	-	-	1	1	1
13	-	-	2	2	2
17	-	2	-	2	4
21	1	1	1	3	6
24	1	1	1	3	6
Totals	2	4	5	11	19
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES					
Mood Characteristics	20	12	14	46	98
% of total	(27.4)	(16.4)	(19.2)	(21.0)	
Music Characteristics	49	50	39	138	286
% of total	(67.1)	(68.5)	(53.4)	(63.0)	
No. of no responses	4	11	20	35	54
% of total	(5.5)	(15.1)	(27.4)	(16.0)	

TABLE 5G-16

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 3 Fifth Concert
Auditors in Music Training Group III

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	CHOICES First	 Second	 Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS					
5	-	-	1	1	1
7	-	2	-	2	4
Totals	-	2	1	3	5

TABLE 5G-16 (continued)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS					
Pervading Characteristics					
20	-	1	1	2	3
27	7	2	-	9	25
31	1	-	1	2	4
Totals	8	3	2	13	32
Significant Characteristics					
9	1	-	1	2	4
14	1	-	-	1	3
23	-	-	1	1	1
32	-	-	1	1	1
35	-	-	1	1	1
36	-	1	-	1	2
Totals	2	1	4	7	12
Peripheral Characteristics					
19	1	-	1	2	4
25	-	1	-	1	2
Totals	1	1	1	3	6
Characteristics not related					
13	-	1	-	1	2
Totals	-	1	-	1	2
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES					
Mood Characteristics	-	2	1	3	5
% of total	(00.0)	(16.7)	(8.3)	(8.3)	
Music Characteristics	11	6	7	24	52
% of total	(91.7)	(50.0)	(58.4)	(66.7)	
No. of no responses	1	4	4	9	15
% of total	(8.3)	(33.3)	(33.3)	(25.0)	

TABLE 5G-17

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 3 Fifth Concert
Auditors in Music Training Category IV

		CHOICES			
CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS					
4	-	1	-	1	2
6	1	-	-	1	3
7	-	1	-	1	2
Totals	1	2	-	3	7
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS					
Pervading Characteristics					
20	-	2	-	2	4
27	5	-	1	6	16
31	-	1	-	1	2
Totals	5	3	1	9	22
Significant Characteristics					
9	1	-	4	5	7
14	-	1	-	1	2
16	-	1	-	1	2
Totals	1	2	4	7	11
Peripheral Characteristics					
NONE					
Characteristics not related					
NONE					
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES					
Mood Characteristics	1	2	-	3	7
% of total	(14.3)	(28.6)	(00.0)	(14.3)	
Music Characteristics	6	5	5	16	33
% of total	(85.7)	(71.4)	(71.4)	(76.2)	
No. of no responses	-	-	2	2	2
% of total	(00.0)	(00.0)	(28.6)	(9.5)	

TABLE 5G-18

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 3 Fifth Concert
Auditors in Music Training Category V

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	CHOICES First	 Second	 Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS					
5	-	1	-	1	2
7	1	-	-	1	3
Totals	1	1	-	2	5
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS					
Pervading Characteristics					
18	-	1	1	2	3
20	-	1	1	2	3
27	2	3	1	6	13
31	-	1	1	2	3
Totals	2	6	4	12	22
Significant Characteristics					
9	2	1	1	4	9
14	2	1	-	3	8
16	1	-	-	1	3
32	-	1	-	1	2
36	-	-	1	1	1
Totals	5	3	2	10	23
Peripheral Characteristics					
19	1	-	-	1	3
25	1	-	-	1	3
Totals	2	-	-	2	6
Characteristics not related					
	NONE				
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES					
Mood Characteristics	1	1	-	2	5
% of total	(10.0)	(10.0)	(00.0)	(6.7)	
Music Characteristics	9	9	6	24	51
% of total	(90.0)	(90.0)	(60.0)	(80.0)	
No. of no responses	-	-	4	4	4
% of total	(00.0)	(00.0)	(40.0)	(13.3)	

Tables 5G-19 through 5G-24 contain the summary of responses for Composition # 4 (Rochberg - Zodiac). (The overall summary is contained in 5G-19, and the listings in terms of formal music training are found in the remaining tables.) For all three choices the emphasis was on the music characteristics of this work. Only twenty-two percent of the auditors selected a mood characteristic as a first choice, and this had diminished to only three percent by the third choice. This was further evidenced by the fact that all eight mood characteristics were selected at least twice, with only one, "dramatic, agitated, exciting, triumphant" (7) being selected frequently enough to be considered significant, and even its significance is limited because of the general overall distribution of the mood characteristic responses. The auditors tended to have more difficulty in selecting a mood characteristic for the less traditional works. There was consistently a scattering of the responses, in terms of mood, for the less traditional works.

Of the 28 music characteristics selected at least once by the auditors, seven stood out as being significant. They were, in the order of frequency of selection:

9. irregular melodic contour, disjointed (angular)
32. percussion color
27. strange orchestral effects
14. dissonant sounds
19. disjointed series of sounds (pointillistic)
31. dynamic contrast of the music
36. irregular rhythms.

For the first time, rhythmic characteristics were given a significant number of responses. However, the dissonant and disjointed character of the work was emphasized by the selection of those characteristics which stressed those stylistic features. While not mentioned individually enough to be considered significant, those characteristics which were determined by the styles analysts to be pervading were all mentioned by several auditors. Hence the auditors tended to agree rather substantially with the styles analysts.

TABLE 5G-19

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 4 Fifth Concert
Overall Summary

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	CHOICES First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS					
1	2	-	1	3	7
2	3	3	1	7	16
3	-	1	1	2	3
4	2	-	-	2	6
5	4	3	-	7	18
6	1	4	-	5	11
7	14	4	2	20	52
8	6	3	-	9	24
Totals	32	18	5	55	137
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS					
Pervading Characteristics					
9	16	15	4	35	82
11	3	1	3	7	14
14	7	9	5	21	44
17	5	3	2	10	23
19	7	8	6	21	43
20	3	4	3	10	20
25	1	5	4	10	17
27	9	9	9	27	54
32	11	10	7	28	60
36	7	3	4	14	31
Totals	69	67	47	183	388
Significant Characteristics					
23	2	4	5	11	19
28	4	1	6	11	20
29	2	-	1	3	7
31	4	4	8	16	28
33	5	4	2	11	25
35	1	2	-	3	7
37	1	1	-	2	5
Totals	19	16	22	57	111

TABLE 5G-19 (continued)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS (continued)					
Peripheral Characteristics					
12	1	1	1	3	6
16	2	4	6	11	19
21	2	-	-	2	6
26	1	-	-	1	3
Totals	6	5	6	17	34
Characteristics not related					
10	2	2	4	8	14
13	-	2	1	3	5
15	1	-	-	1	3
18	2	1	4	7	12
22	-	-	1	1	1
24	2	1	2	5	10
30	1	-	-	1	3
Totals	8	6	12	26	48
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES					
Mood Characteristics	32	18	5	55	137
% of total	(21.6)	(12.2)	(3.4)	(12.4)	
Music Characteristics	102	94	87	283	583
% of total	(68.9)	(63.5)	(58.8)	(63.7)	
No. of no responses	14	36	56	106	169
% of total	(9.5)	(24.3)	(37.8)	(23.9)	

TABLE 5G-20

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 4 Fifth Concert
Auditors in Music Training Category I

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	CHOICES Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS					
1	1	-	1	2	4
2	1	-	-	1	3
3	-	1	-	1	2
4	1	-	-	1	3
5	3	-	-	3	9
6	-	2	-	2	4
7	1	2	1	4	8
8	4	1	-	5	14
Totals	11	6	2	19	47
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS					
Pervading Characteristics					
9	6	2	2	10	24
11	1	-	1	2	4
14	1	3	1	5	10
17	1	1	1	3	6
19	3	4	1	8	18
20	1	-	1	2	4
25	-	1	2	3	4
27	1	3	3	7	12
32	2	3	2	7	14
36	2	-	1	3	7
Totals	18	17	15	50	103
Significant Characteristics					
23	1	2	1	4	8
28	1	1	1	3	6
29	1	-	-	1	3
31	2	-	3	5	9
35	1	-	-	1	3
37	1	-	-	1	3
Totals	7	3	5	15	32

TABLE 5G-20 (continued)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS (continued)					
Peripheral Characteristics					
16	1	1	1	3	6
Totals	1	1	1	3	6
Characteristics not related					
10	1	2	2	5	9
13	-	2	1	3	5
15	1	-	-	1	3
18	-	-	1	1	1
24	-	1	-	1	2
Totals	2	5	4	11	20
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES					
Mood Characteristics	11	6	2	19	47
% of total	(23.9)	(13.0)	(4.3)	(13.8)	
Music Characteristics	28	26	25	79	161
% of total	(60.9)	(56.5)	(54.3)	(57.2)	
No. of no responses	7	14	19	40	68
% of total	(15.2)	(30.5)	(41.4)	(29.0)	

TABLE 5G-21

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 4 Fifth Concert
Auditors in Music Training Category II

		CHOICES			
CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS					
1	1	-	-	1	3
2	1	3	1	5	10
3	-	-	1	1	1
4	1	-	-	1	3
5	1	3	-	4	9
6	1	2	-	3	7
7	10	2	0	12	34
8	1	2	-	3	7
Totals	16	12	2	30	74

TABLE 5G-21 (continued)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS					
Pervading Characteristics					
9	8	6	2	16	38
11	2	1	1	4	9
14	4	3	3	10	21
17	3	2	1	6	14
19	1	3	3	7	12
20	1	2	-	3	7
25	1	2	2	5	9
27	6	5	4	15	32
32	8	3	2	13	32
36	4	2	3	9	19
Totals	38	29	21	88	193
Significant Characteristics					
23	-	2	4	6	8
28	3	-	4	7	13
29	1	-	1	2	4
31	-	3	3	6	9
33	3	3	1	7	16
35	-	1	-	1	2
37	-	1	-	1	2
Totals	7	10	13	30	54
Peripheral Characteristics					
12	1	-	-	1	3
16	1	3	3	6	9
21	1	-	-	1	3
Totals	2	3	3	8	15
Characteristics not related					
10	1	-	1	2	4
18	1	1	1	3	6
22	-	-	1	1	1
24	2	-	2	4	8
30	1	-	-	1	3
Totals	5	1	5	11	22

TABLE 5G-21 (continued)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES					
Mood Characteristics	16	12	2	30	74
% of total	(21.9)	(16.4)	(2.7)	(13.7)	
Music Characteristics	52	43	42	137	284
% of total	(71.2)	(58.9)	(57.5)	(62.6)	
No. of no responses	5	18	29	52	80
% of total	(6.9)	(24.7)	(39.8)	(23.7)	

TABLE 5G-22

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 4 Fifth Concert
Auditors in Music Training Category III

	CHOICES				
CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS					
7	2	-	-	2	6
8	1	-	-	1	3
Totals	3	-	-	3	9
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS					
Pervading Characteristics					
9	1	3	-	4	9
14	-	1	1	2	3
19	1	-	1	2	4
20	1	1	-	2	5
27	-	-	1	1	1
32	-	2	2	4	6
36	1	1	-	2	5
Totals	4	8	5	17	33

TABLE 5G-22 (continued)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS (continued)					
Significant Characteristics					
23	1	-	-	1	3
31	1	1	2	4	7
33	1	-	-	1	3
Totals	3	1	2	6	13
Peripheral Characteristics					
12	-	1	-	1	2
16	1	-	1	2	4
Totals	1	1	1	3	6
Characteristics not related					
18	-	-	1	1	1
Totals	-	-	1	1	1
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES					
Mood Characteristics	3	-	-	3	9
% of total	(25.9)	(00.0)	(00.0)	(8.3)	
Music Characteristics	8	10	9	27	53
% of total	(66.7)	(83.3)	(75.0)	(75.0)	
No. of no responses	1	2	3	6	10
% of total	(8.3)	(16.7)	(25.0)	(16.7)	

TABLE 5G-23

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 4 Fifth Concert
Auditors in Music Training Category IV

		CHOICES			
CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS					
		NONE			

TABLE 5G-23 (continued)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS					
Pervading Characteristics					
9	1	2	-	3	7
14	-	2	-	2	4
19	1	-	-	1	3
20	-	-	2	2	2
25	-	2	-	2	4
27	2	-	-	2	6
32	1	-	-	1	3
Totals	5	6	2	13	29
Significant Characteristics					
33	1	-	1	2	4
Totals	1	-	1	2	4
Peripheral Characteristics					
12	-	-	1	1	1
21	1	-	-	1	3
Totals	1	-	1	2	4
Characteristics not related					
NONE					
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES					
Mood Characteristics	-	-	-	-	-
% of total	(00.0)	(00.0)	(00.0)	(00.0)	
Music Characteristics	7	6	4	17	37
% of total	(100.0)	(85.7)	(57.1)	(81.0)	
No. of no responses	-	1	3	4	5
% of total	(00.0)	(14.3)	(42.9)	(19.0)	

TABLE 5G-24

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 4 Fifth Concert
Auditors in Music Training Category V

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	CHOICES First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS					
2	1	-	-	1	3
7	1	-	1	2	4
Totals	2	-	1	3	7
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS					
Pervading Characteristics					
9	-	2	-	2	4
11	-	-	1	1	1
14	2	-	-	2	6
17	1	-	-	1	3
19	1	1	1	3	6
20	-	1	-	1	2
27	-	1	1	2	3
32	-	2	1	3	5
Totals	4	7	4	15	30
Significant Characteristics					
28	-	-	1	1	1
31	1	-	-	1	3
33	-	1	-	1	2
35	-	1	-	1	2
Totals	1	2	1	4	8
Peripheral Characteristics					
26	1	-	-	1	3
Totals	1	-	-	1	3
Characteristics not related					
10	-	-	1	1	1
18	1	-	1	2	4
Totals	1	-	2	3	5

TABLE 5G-24 (continued)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES					
Mood Characteristics	2	-	1	3	7
% of total	(20.0)	(00.0)	(10.0)	(10.0)	
Music Characteristics	7	9	7	2	46
% of total	(70.0)	(90.0)	(70.0)	(76.7)	
No. of no responses	1	1	2	4	7
% of total	(10.0)	(10.0)	(20.0)	(13.3)	

Tables 5G-25 through 5G-30 contain the summary of responses for Composition # 5 (Kraft - Three Pieces). (The overall summary is contained in 5G-25, and the listings in terms of formal music training are found in the remaining tables.) Since this work consisted of three distinctly different pieces it was expected that the responses to mood and music characteristics would be diverse. And such was the case. However, the frequency of selection of mood characteristics was low with only twenty-seven percent of the auditors selecting a mood characteristic as a first choice. It was much lower as far as second and third choices were concerned. All eight mood characteristics were selected at least three times. One was selected with enough frequency to be considered significant, namely, "dramatic, agitated, exciting, triumphant" (7). The other mood characteristics were grouped rather closely together in terms of frequency of selection.

Stylistically no music characteristic was determined to be a "pervading characteristic" by the styles analysts. 20 music characteristics were considered by the styles analysts to be "significant." With this judgment the auditors were very much in accord. There was a general scattering of responses among the 20 "significant" characteristics. Six were selected with the greatest frequency, with no one music characteristic standing out over the others. Those mentioned most often, in their order of frequency, were:

9. irregular melodic contour, disjointed (angular)
31. dynamic contrast of the music
32. percussion color
14. dissonant sounds
27. strange orchestral effects
19. disjointed series of sounds (pointillistic)

TABLE 5G-25

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 5 Fifth Concert
Overall Summary

		CHOICES			
CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS					
1	5	-	-	5	15
2	8	2	-	10	28
3	5	1	-	6	17
4	1	3	-	4	9
5	3	-	-	3	9
6	4	3	4	11	22
7	13	13	5	31	70
8	1	5	2	8	15
Totals	40	27	11	78	185
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS					
Pervading Characteristics					
NONE					
Significant Characteristics					
9	18	8	5	31	75
10	4	5	3	12	25
14	6	4	7	17	33
17	2	1	1	4	9
18	3	3	3	9	18
19	3	4	5	12	22
20	-	5	1	6	11
21	-	1	2	3	4
23	2	2	1	5	11
25	4	4	6	14	26
26	2	1	2	5	10
27	5	7	2	14	31
28	4	2	2	8	18
29	5	2	5	10	20

TABLE 5G-25 (continued)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS (continued)					
Significant Characteristics (continued)					
31	6	5	7	18	35
32	6	9	3	18	39
33	1	4	1	6	12
34	1	-	-	1	3
36	1	3	7	11	16
37	1	3	3	7	12
Totals	74	73	66	213	434
Peripheral Characteristics					
12	1	-	1	2	4
13	2	1	1	4	9
15	2	-	-	2	6
16	2	2	4	8	14
35	3	2	-	5	13
Totals	10	5	6	21	46
Characteristics not related					
11	3	2	1	6	14
24	1	-	-	1	3
Totals	4	2	1	7	17
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES					
Mood Characteristics	40	27	11	78	185
% of total	(27.0)	(18.2)	(7.4)	(17.6)	(20.8)
Music Characteristics	88	80	73	241	497
% of total	(59.5)	(54.1)	(49.3)	(54.3)	(56.0)
No. of no responses	20	41	64	125	206
% of total	(13.5)	(27.7)	(43.2)	(28.1)	(23.2)

TABLE 5G-26

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 5 Fifth Concert
Auditors in Music Training Category I

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	CHOICES				
	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS					
2	4	-	-	4	12
3	2	-	-	2	6
5	1	-	-	1	3
6	3	1	1	5	12
7	4	5	1	10	23
8	1	2	1	4	8
Totals	15	8	3	26	64
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS					
Pervading Characteristics					
N O N E					
Significant Characteristics					
9	6	2	2	10	24
10	1	3	1	5	10
14	1	2	-	3	7
17	1	-	-	1	3
19	1	1	1	3	6
21	-	-	1	1	1
23	2	-	-	2	6
25	1	1	2	4	7
26	1	-	1	2	4
27	2	3	1	6	13
28	1	-	-	1	3
29	-	-	1	1	1
31	2	2	1	5	11
32	2	2	2	6	12
33	-	2	-	2	4
36	-	2	5	7	9
37	-	1	-	1	2
Totals	21	21	18	60	123

TABLE 5G-26 (continued)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS (continued)					
Peripheral Characteristics					
12	-	-	1	1	1
13	-	1	-	1	2
16	1	2	-	3	7
35	1	-	-	1	3
Totals	2	3	1	6	13
Characteristics not related					
11	2	1	-	3	8
Totals	2	1	-	3	8
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES					
Mood Characteristics	15	8	3	26	64
% of total	(32.6)	(17.4)	(6.5)	(18.8)	(23.2)
Music Characteristics	25	25	19	69	144
% of total	(54.3)	(54.3)	(41.3)	(50.0)	(52.2)
No. of no responses	6	13	24	43	68
% of total	(13.1)	(28.3)	(52.2)	(31.2)	(24.6)

TABLE 5G-27

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 5 Fifth Concert
Auditors in Music Trainihg Category II

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	CHOICES First	 Second	 Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS					
1	5	-	-	5	15
2	2	2	-	4	10
3	3	1	-	4	11
4	1	3	-	4	9
5	1	-	-	1	3
6	1	1	2	4	7
7	4	6	3	13	27
8	-	2	1	3	5
Totals	17	15	6	38	87

TABLE 5G-27 (continued)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS					
Pervading Characteristics	N O N E				
Significant Characteristics					
9	9	3	2	14	35
10	2	1	2	5	10
14	4	-	2	6	14
17	1	-	-	1	3
18	2	2	1	5	11
19	1	3	3	7	12
20	-	3	1	4	7
21	-	1	1	2	3
23	-	2	-	2	4
25	2	2	4	8	14
26	1	1	1	3	6
27	2	3	1	6	13
28	1	-	2	3	5
29	4	1	3	8	17
31	3	2	6	11	19
32	3	7	-	10	23
33	1	1	1	3	6
34	1	-	-	1	3
36	1	1	1	3	6
37	-	1	2	3	4
Totals	38	34	33	105	215
Peripheral Characteristics					
12	1	-	-	1	3
13	1	-	-	1	3
15	1	-	-	1	3
16	1	-	-	1	3
35	-	1	-	1	2
Totals	4	1	-	5	14
Characteristics not related					
11	1	1	1	3	6
Totals	1	1	1	3	6

TABLE 5G-27 (continued)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES					
Mood Characteristics	17	15	6	38	87
% of total	(23.3)	(20.5)	(8.2)	(17.4)	(19.9)
Music Characteristics	43	36	34	113	235
% of total	(58.9)	(49.3)	(46.6)	(51.6)	(53.7)
No. of no responses	13	22	33	68	116
% of total	(17.8)	(30.2)	(45.2)	(31.0)	(26.4)

TABLE 5G-28

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 5 Fifth Concert
Auditors in Music Training Category III

CHARACTERISTIC NO.		CHOICES			
	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS					
2	1	-	-	1	3
6	-	-	1	1	1
7	3	1	-	4	11
Totals	4	1	1	6	15
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS					
Pervading Characteristics		NONE			
Significant Characteristics					
9	-	1	1	2	3
10	-	1	-	1	2
14	1	1	1	3	6
18	-	1	-	1	2
19	1	-	-	1	3
20	-	1	-	1	2
25	1	-	-	1	3
28	1	1	-	2	5
29	-	-	1	1	1
31	-	1	-	1	2
32	1	-	-	1	3
33	-	1	-	1	2
36	-	-	1	1	1
37	-	-	1	1	1
Totals	5	8	5	18	36

TABLE 5G-28 (continued)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS (continued)					
Peripheral Characteristics					
13	1	-	-	1	3
16	-	-	3	3	3
35	1	-	-	1	3
Totals	2	-	3	5	9
Characteristics not related	NONE				
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES					
Mood Characteristics	4	1	1	6	15
% of total	(33.3)	(8.3)	(8.3)	(16.7)	(20.8)
Music Characteristics	7	8	8	23	45
% of total	(58.4)	(66.7)	(66.7)	(63.9)	(62.5)
No. of no responses	1	3	3	7	12
% of total	(8.3)	(25.0)	(25.0)	(19.4)	(16.7)

TABLE 5G-29

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 5 Fifth Concert
Auditors in Music Training Category IV

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	CHOICES First	 Second	 Third	 Total	 Sum
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS					
7	2	-	-	2	6
Totals	2	-	-	2	6

TABLE 5G-29 (continued)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS					
Pervading Characteristics N O N E					
Significant Characteristics					
9	1	1	-	2	5
17	-	-	1	1	1
18	-	-	1	1	1
19	-	-	1	1	1
20	-	1	-	1	2
27	1	1	-	2	5
28	1	1	-	2	5
29	1	1	-	2	5
32	-	-	1	1	1
Totals	4	5	4	13	26
Peripheral Characteristics					
15	1	-	-	1	3
16	-	-	1	1	1
35	-	1	-	1	2
Totals	1	1	1	3	6
Characteristics not related N O N E					
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES					
Mood Characteristics	2	-	-	2	6
% of total	(28.6)	(00.0)	(00.0)	(9.5)	(14.3)
Music Characteristics	5	6	5	16	32
% of total	(71.4)	(85.7)	(71.4)	(76.2)	(76.2)
No. of no responses	-	1	2	3	4
% of total	(00.0)	(14.3)	(28.6)	(14.3)	(9.5)

TABLE 5G-30

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 5 Fifth Concert
Auditors in Music Training Category V

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	CHOICES First	CHOICES Second	CHOICES Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS					
2	1	-	-	1	3
5	1	-	-	1	3
6	-	1	-	1	2
7	-	1	1	2	3
8	-	1	-	1	2
Totals	2	3	1	6	13
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS					
Pervading Characteristics NONE					
Significant Characteristics					
9	2	1	-	3	8
10	1	-	-	1	3
14	-	1	4	5	6
17	-	1	-	1	2
18	1	-	1	1	4
23	-	-	1	1	1
25	-	1	-	1	2
31	1	-	-	1	3
37	1	1	-	2	5
Totals	6	5	6	17	34
Peripheral Characteristics					
13	-	-	1	1	1
35	1	-	-	1	3
Totals	1	-	1	2	4
Characteristics not related					
24	1	-	-	1	3
Totals	1	-	-	1	3

TABLE 5G-30 (continued)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES					
Mood Characteristics	2	3	1	6	13
% of total	(20.0)	(30.0)	(10.0)	(20.0)	(21.7)
Music Characteristics	8	5	7	20	41
% of total	(80.0)	(50.0)	(70.0)	(66.7)	(68.3)
No. of no responses	-	2	2	4	6
% of total	(00.0)	(20.0)	(20.0)	(13.3)	(10.0)

Tables 5G-31 through 5G-37 contain the summary of responses for Composition # 6 (Starer - Samson Agonistes). (The overall summary is contained in 5G-31, and the listings in terms of formal music training are found in the remaining tables.) The traditional sound of this composition was evident in the emphasis on mood characteristics as first choices. Again, however, the emphasis was upon music characteristics as second and third choices. One mood characteristic stood out as easily the most significant response by the auditors in relating the various characteristics to the composition. It was "dramatic, agitated, exciting, triumphant" (7). Two other mood characteristics were mentioned with enough frequency to be considered significant. They were "majestic, martial, vigorous" (8) and "bright, cheerful, gay" (6).

23 music characteristics were selected by the auditors. Of this number seven were selected with enough frequency to be considered significant. They were, in the order of frequency of selection:

32. percussion color
18. orderliness of structure
33. percussive rhythms
31. dynamic contrast of the music
10. lyric melody
9. irregular melodic contour, disjointed(angular)
25. cluttered texture, busy music.

Both Characteristics 9 and 10 were considered "significant characteristics" by the styles analysts. So it was not unusual for both to be mentioned with about the same frequency by the auditors. The one unusual point of emphasis was that of "cluttered texture, busy music." The styles analysts had indicated that this characteristic was "not related" to the composition. This suggests that some of the auditors chose to describe the fast, moving tutti orchestra passages as being "busy" music. For the texture of the composition could not be properly described as being "cluttered."

TABLE 5G-31

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 6 Fifth Concert
Overall Summary

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	CHOICES First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS					
1	5	2	1	8	20
2	2	2	-	4	10
4	1	2	-	3	7
5	2	-	-	2	6
6	11	2	2	15	39
7	44	14	11	69	171
8	18	8	9	45	79
Totals	83	30	23	146	332
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS					
Pervading Characteristics					
18	6	6	8	20	38
34	-	4	5	9	13
Totals	6	10	13	29	51

TABLE 5G-31 (continued)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS					
Significant Characteristics					
9	3	6	4	13	25
10	5	5	4	14	29
14	4	2	1	7	17
15	-	6	-	6	12
16	-	3	-	3	6
21	-	8	2	10	18
23	1	-	2	3	5
27	3	2	2	7	15
28	2	3	2	7	14
29	2	3	1	6	13
31	1	7	9	17	26
32	9	6	10	25	49
33	6	7	3	16	35
36	1	3	2	6	11
Totals	37	61	42	140	275
Peripheral Characteristics					
13	-	1	2	3	4
19	2	-	-	2	6
20	-	2	2	4	6
24	1	-	1	2	4
37	1	3	3	7	12
Totals	4	6	8	18	32
Characteristics not related					
17	-	1	-	1	2
25	4	5	5	14	27
Totals	4	6	5	15	29
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES					
Mood Characteristics	83	30	23	136	332
% of total	(56.1)	(20.3)	(15.5)	(30.6)	(37.4)
Music Characteristics	51	83	68	202	387
% of total	(34.5)	(56.1)	(45.9)	(45.5)	(43.6)
No. of no responses	14	35	57	106	169
% of total	(9.4)	(23.6)	(38.6)	(23.9)	(19.0)

TABLE 5G-32

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 6 Fifth Concert
Auditors in Music Training Category I

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	CHOICES First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS					
1	2	-	-	2	6
2	1	-	-	1	3
4	-	1	-	1	2
5	1	-	-	1	3
6	5	1	-	6	17
7	13	5	5	23	54
8	2	2	3	7	13
Totals	24	9	8	41	98
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS					
Pervading Characteristics					
18	4	-	-	4	12
34	-	2	1	3	5
Totals	4	2	1	7	17
Significant Characteristics					
9	1	2	1	4	8
10	2	3	3	8	15
14	-	1	-	1	2
15	-	3	-	3	6
16	-	1	-	1	2
21	-	3	-	3	6
27	-	1	1	2	3
28	1	1	1	3	6
29	1	1	-	2	5
31	1	-	4	5	7
32	3	2	3	8	16
33	1	-	1	2	4
Totals	10	18	14	42	80

TABLE 5G-32 (continued)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS (continued)					
Peripheral Characteristics					
13	-	1	-	1	2
19	2	-	-	2	6
37	-	1	1	2	3
Totals	2	2	1	5	11
Characteristics not related					
17	-	1	-	1	2
25	1	2	2	5	9
Totals	1	3	2	6	11
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES					
Mood Characteristics	24	9	8	41	98
% of total	(52.2)	(19.6)	(17.4)	(29.7)	
Music Characteristics	17	25	18	60	119
% of total	(37.0)	(54.3)	(39.1)	(43.5)	
No. of no responses	5	12	20	37	59
% of total	(10.8)	(26.1)	(43.5)	(26.8)	

TABLE 5G-33

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 6 Fifth Concert
Auditors in Music Training Category II

	CHOICES				
CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS					
1	3	2	-	5	13
2	1	1	-	2	5
4	1	1	-	2	5
5	1	-	-	1	3
6	4	-	2	6	14
7	20	6	5	31	77
8	12	5	5	22	51
Totals	42	15	12	69	168

TABLE 5G-33 (continued)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS					
Pervading Characteristics					
18	-	4	3	7	11
34	-	2	4	6	8
Totals	-	6	7	13	19
Significant Characteristics					
9	1	3	3	7	12
10	2	1	1	4	9
14	2	1	1	4	9
15	-	2	-	2	4
21	-	5	1	6	11
23	-	-	1	1	1
27	2	1	1	4	9
28	1	1	1	3	6
29	1	2	1	4	8
31	-	4	2	6	10
32	6	3	5	14	29
33	3	5	2	10	21
36	1	1	2	4	7
Totals	19	29	21	69	139
Peripheral Characteristics					
13	-	-	2	2	2
24	1	-	-	1	3
37	1	2	2	5	9
Totals	2	2	4	8	14
Characteristics not related					
25	2	3	1	6	13
Totals	2	3	1	6	13

TABLE 5G-33 (continued)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES					
Mood Characteristics	42	15	12	69	168
% of total	(57.5)	(20.5)	(16.4)	(31.5)	
Music Characteristics	23	40	33	96	182
% of total	(31.5)	(54.8)	(45.2)	(43.8)	
No. of no responses	8	18	28	54	88
% of total	(11.0)	(24.7)	(38.4)	(24.7)	

TABLE 5G-34

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 6 Fifth Concert
Auditors in Music Training Category III

		CHOICES			
CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS					
7	5	1	1	7	18
8	3	1	-	4	11
Totals	8	2	1	11	29
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS					
Pervading Characteristics					
18	-	1	3	4	5
Totals	-	1	3	4	5
Significant Characteristics					
9	1	-	-	1	3
14	1	-	-	1	3
16	-	2	-	2	4
31	-	2	-	2	4
32	-	-	1	1	1
33	1	1	-	2	5
36	-	1	-	1	2
Totals	3	6	1	10	22

TABLE 5G-34 (continued)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS (continued)					
Peripheral Characteristics					
20	-	-	1	1	1
24	-	-	1	1	1
Totals	-	-	2	2	2
Characteristics not related					
25	-	-	2	2	2
Totals	-	-	2	2	2
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES					
Mood Characteristics	8	2	1	11	29
% of total	(66.7)	(16.7)	(8.3)	(30.6)	
Music Characteristics	3	7	8	18	31
% of total	(25.0)	(58.3)	(66.7)	(50.0)	
No. of no responses	1	3	3	7	12
% of total	(8.3)	(25.0)	(25.0)	(19.4)	

TABLE 5G-35

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 6 Fifth Concert
Auditors in Music Training Category IV

	CHOICES				
CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS					
6	-	1	-	1	2
7	4	1	-	5	14
8	1	-	-	1	3
Totals	5	2	-	7	19

TABLE 5G-35 (continued)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS					
Pervading Characteristics					
18	1	-	1	2	4
Totals	1	-	1	2	4
Significant Characteristics					
27	1	-	-	1	3
31	-	-	2	2	2
32	-	1	-	1	2
33	-	1	-	1	2
36	-	1	-	1	2
Totals	1	3	2	6	11
Peripheral Characteristics					
20	-	1	1	2	3
Totals	-	1	1	2	3
Characteristics not related					
NONE					
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES					
Mood Characteristics	5	2	-	7	19
% of total	(71.4)	(28.6)	(00.0)	(33.3)	
Music Characteristics	2	4	4	10	18
% of total	(28.6)	(57.1)	(57.1)	(47.6)	
No. of no responses	-	1	3	4	5
% of total	(00.0)	(14.3)	(42.9)	(19.1)	

TABLE 5G-36

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 6 Fifth Concert
Auditors in Music Training Category V

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	CHOICES First	 Second	 Third	 Total	 Sum
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS					
1	-	-	1	1	1
2	-	1	-	1	2
6	2	-	-	2	6
7	2	1	-	3	8
8	-	-	1	1	1
Totals	4	2	2	8	18
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS					
Pervading Characteristics					
18	1	1	1	3	6
Totals	1	1	1	3	6
Significant Characteristics					
9	-	1	-	1	2
10	1	1	-	2	5
14	1	-	-	1	3
15	-	1	-	1	2
21	-	-	1	1	1
23	1	-	1	2	4
28	-	1	-	1	2
31	-	1	1	2	3
32	-	-	1	1	1
33	1	-	-	1	3
Totals	4	5	4	13	26
Peripheral Characteristics					
20	-	1	-	1	2
Totals	-	1	-	1	2

TABLE 5G-36 (continued)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS (continued)					
Characteristics not related					
25	1	-	-	1	3
Totals	1	-	-	1	3
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES					
Mood Characteristics	4	2	2	8	18
% of total	(40.0)	(20.0)	(20.0)	(26.7)	(30.0)
Music Characteristics	6	7	5	18	37
% of total	(60.0)	(70.0)	(50.0)	(60.0)	(61.7)
No. of no responses	-	1	3	4	5
% of total	(00.0)	(10.0)	(30.0)	(40.0)	(8.3)

In summary, several patterns were observed conconcerning the responses of the auditors to the stylistic characteristics of the compositions. First, the auditors generally agreed with the styles analysts as to which music characteristics were most important. On the other hand, they did not always agree as to which mood characteristics were more prevalent.

Those auditors with limited or no training were more likely to select mood characteristics as a first choice than were those with more extensive training. Those with more extensive formal music training were more likely to select music characteristics as a first choice.

If the music seemed to the auditor to sound more traditional, he was more likely to select a mood characteristic as a first choice. On the other hand, even those auditors with little or no music training tended to place more emphasis on music characteristics as a first choice.

Auditors tended to select certain characteristics more frequently than others. For example, "dissonant sounds" was selected frequently enough to be considered significant in those compositions where it was a valid choice (in terms of stylistic analysis). However, even when stylistically it was present, little mention was made of "consonant sounds." References to melody, especially "lyric melody" and "irregular melodic contour" generally constituted significant responses in all six compositions.

Rather infrequent mention was made of structural characteristics unless "orderliness of structure" was apparent, or "interweaving of melodies, contrapuntal" were obvious characteristics.

Sixth Concert

The sixth concert of the Exposition of Contemporary American Music was presented at Miami University by the Cincinnati Symphony Orchestra, with Max Rudolf conducting.

A total of 413 questionnaires were distributed to the audience as they entered the hall. 293 questionnaires were returned at the end of the concert, of which 174 were completely filled out and usable in the study. This constituted a forty-two percent return of usable questionnaires.

This concert was a repetition of the Fifth Concert, with the same six compositions being performed. They were:

1.	Tetrameron	Russell Smith
2.	Threnody for Strings	Robert Lombardo
3.	Variazione	George H. Crumb
4.	Zodiac	George Rochberg
5.	Three Pieces for Orchestra	Leo Kraft
6.	Samson Agonistes	Robert Starer

Analysis of the data in terms of the independent variable, Occupation. Table 6A indicates the distribution of the auditors forming the sample for the Sixth Concert in terms of their Occupation. An examination of the distribution indicated that the "college student" group was the only group with a sufficient number of auditors. All other groups were too small to be of value in the statistical analysis. Therefore, any statistical significance which might have been inferred in a study of the data was related simply to whether or not the "college student" group differed significantly from the rest of the sample.

Tables 6A-1 through 6A-6 list the preference responses in terms of Occupation for each of the six compositions.

The responses to Composition # 1 (Smith - Tetrameron) and Composition # 2 (Lombardo - Threnody) did not differ significantly. The responses to Composition # 3 (Crumb - Variazione) yielded an F score of .926, which was significant at the .500 level. However, because of the small size of all groups except the "college student" group, no significance was given to the differences in mean responses. (See Tables 6A-1, 6A-2, and 6A-3.)

The F score for Composition # 4 (Rochberg - Zodiac) was 2.845, significant at the .990 level. The higher mean response of the "college student" group, when compared with the negative mean responses of most of the other groups, can be considered to be of some significance. (See Table 6A-4.)

The same difference occurred with respect to the responses to Composition # 5 (Kraft - Three Pieces), which yielded an F score of 1.328, significant at the .750 level. Again the mean response of the "college student" group differed significantly from the negative mean responses of most of the other groups and from the high mean response of the "proprietor, manager" group. This also was of some significance. (See Table 6A-5.)

Again, in Composition # 6 (Starer - Samson Agonistes), the high mean response of the "college student" group differed significantly from seven of the other groupings, namely, those with a mean response of 1.0000 or less. This too can be considered significant. (See Table 6A-6.)

One reason for the significant difference in the responses of the "college student" group to the other groups represented in the sample was probably associated with the backgrounds of the audience. The Sixth Concert was presented as a special Mother's Day concert at Miami University and the bulk of the audience consisted of Miami University students accompanied by their parents. In general, the parents were not aware that the concert was to be devoted to a performance of contemporary American Music. As can be ascertained or implied by an examination of the Occupations of the auditors forming the sample, the number of parents who returned completed questionnaires was relatively quite small. On the other hand the audience at the Fifth Concert, which was held at the University of Cincinnati, came prepared to listen to a preformance of contemporary American Music. Thus the general backgrounds and interests of the two audiences were quite different. The college students in attendance at the Sixth Concert could be expected to have had a more diverse background and hence more exposure to contemporary music styles. Therefore any significance attached to the differences in responses in terms of Occupation was "colored" by the somewhat different circumstances under which the audience was present at the concert.

It should be noted that many of the questionnaires which were returned, and which were usable, were handed in during the intermission which occurred at the comclusion of the performance of Composition # 3.

TABLE 6A

Occupations of Auditors - Sixth Concert

Occupation	Number
college professor	7
elementary or high school teacher	9
musician	10
other professionals	12
proprietor, manager	7
dealer	3
clerk, office worker	5
farmer	1
foreman, skilled labor	5
semi-skilled labor	2
college student	113
total	174

TABLE 6A-1

Preference Responses in Terms of Occupation
Composition # 1 Sixth Concert

F score - .453 - not significant

OCCUPATION	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
college professor	0	3	2	2	0	0.1429
elem./h.s. teacher	0	7	1	1	0	0.6667
musician	2	6	0	2	0	0.8000
other professionals	3	4	0	4	1	0.3333
proprietor, manager	1	4	1	1	0	0.7143
dealer	1	1	1	0	0	1.0000
clerk, office worker	1	0	2	2	0	0.0000
farmer	0	0	1	0	0	0.0000
foreman, skilled labor	1	1	1	1	1	0.0000
semi-skilled labor	0	1	1	0	0	0.5000
college student	14	65	19	12	3	0.6637

TABLE 6A-2

Preference Responses in Terms of Occupation
Composition # 2 Sixth Concert

F score -.417 - not significant

OCCUPATION	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
college professor	1	2	2	2	0	0.2857
elem./h.s. teacher	1	3	2	3	0	0.2222
musician	3	4	1	1	1	0.7000
other professionals	1	3	4	3	1	0.0000
proprietor, manager	0	2	3	2	0	0.0000
dealer	0	3	0	0	0	1.0000
clerk, office worker	1	1	2	1	0	0.4000
farmer	0	1	0	0	0	1.0000
foreman,skilled labor	1	1	0	3	0	0.0000
semi-skilled labor	1	0	1	0	0	1.0000
college student	3	45	32	24	4	0.2566

TABLE 6A-3

Preference Responses in Terms of Occupation
Composition # 3 Sixth Concert

F score - .926 - significant at the .500 level

OCCUPATION	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
college professor	0	3	0	3	1	-0.2857
elem./h.s. teacher	3	3	2	0	1	0.7778
musician	4	4	1	1	0	1.1000
other professionals	3	6	0	2	1	0.6667
proprietor, manager	1	4	1	1	0	0.7143
dealer	1	1	0	1	0	0.6667
clerk, office worker	0	3	1	1	0	0.4000
farmer	1	0	0	0	0	2.0000
foreman,skilled labor	1	1	0	2	1	-0.2000
semi-skilled labor	1	0	1	0	0	1.0000
college student	45	33	19	9	7	0.8850

TABLE 6A-4

Preference Responses in Terms of Occupation
Composition # 4 Sixth Concert

F score - 2.845 - significant at the .990 level

OCCUPATION	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
college professor	0	0	2	2	3	-1.1429
elem./h.s. teacher	0	2	1	3	3	-0.7778
musician	1	3	1	4	1	-0.1000
other professionals	0	2	2	6	2	-0.6667
proprietor, manager	0	2	3	2	0	0.0000
dealer	0	0	2	0	1	-0.5000
clerk, office worker	0	1	2	2	0	-0.2000
farmer	0	1	0	0	0	1.0000
foreman, skilled labor	0	1	1	3	0	-0.4000
semi-skilled labor	0	0	2	0	0	0.0000
college student	19	41	31	17	5	0.4602

TABLE 6A-5

Preference Responses in Terms of Occupation
Composition # 5 Sixth Concert

F score - 1.328 - significant at the .750 level

OCCUPATION	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
college professor	0	2	2	1	2	-0.4386
elem./h.s. teacher	0	1	4	4	0	-0.3333
musician	0	3	1	6	0	-0.3000
other professionals	1	1	3	7	0	-0.3333
proprietor, manager	1	5	0	1	0	0.8571
dealer	0	1	1	1	0	0.0000
clerk, office worker	1	1	0	2	1	-0.2000
farmer	0	0	0	1	0	-1.0000
foreman, skilled labor	1	2	1	1	0	0.6000
semi-skilled labor	0	1	1	0	0	0.5000
college student	12	43	33	20	5	0.3274

TABLE 6A-6

Preference Responses in Terms of Occupation
Composition # 6 Sixth Concert

F score - 3.911 - significant at the .995 level

OCCUPATION	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
college professor	2	3	0	0	2	0.4286
elem./h.s teacher	1	7	0	1	0	0.8889
musician	4	5	0	1	0	1.2000
other professionals	1	5	3	1	2	0.1667
proprietor, manager	5	2	0	0	0	1.7143
dealer	2	1	0	0	0	1.6667
clerk, office worker	2	0	2	1	0	0.6000
farmer	0	0	1	0	0	0.0000
foreman, skilled labor	1	1	2	1	0	0.4000
semi-skilled labor	1	0	1	0	0	1.0000
college student	78	28	3	3	1	1.5841

Analysis of the data in terms of the independent variable, Age Level. Table 6B indicates the distribution of the auditors forming the sample for the Sixth Concert in terms of their Age Level. Three of the age groups were of sufficient size to be useful in the statistical analysis. They were the "21 or under" group, the "22 - 25" age group, and the "46 - 55" age group. The "56 - 65" age group was large enough to be of some limited value. The other three groups were too small to be of value and were included in the tables for general information.

Tables 6B-1 through 6B-6 list the preference responses in terms of Age Level for each of the six compositions performed.

The F score for Composition # 1 (Smith - Tetrameron) was 1.024, significant at the .500 level. The low mean response of the "46 - 55" group provided the basis for the significant difference. This was of limited significance. (See Table 6B-1.)

The responses to Composition # 2 (Lombardo - Threnody) were not significantly different. (See Table 6B-2.)

The responses to Composition # 3 (Crumb - Variazione) yielded an F score of 1.603, which was significant at the .750 level. Here the high mean response of the "22 - 25" age group was significantly higher than the mean responses of the "21 or under" and the "46 - 55" age groups. This difference is somewhat more significant. (See Table 6B-3.)

The negative mean response of the "46 - 55" age group for Composition # 4 (Rochberg - Zodiac) was significantly different from the higher mean response of the "22 - 25" age group. The F score was 5.890, which was significant at the .995 level. (See Table 6B-4.)

The same response pattern occurred in the case of Composition # 5 (Kraft - Three Pieces) where the negative mean responses of the "46 - 55" and "56 - 65" age groups differed significantly from the "22 - 25" age group. Here the F score was 2.658, significant at the .975 level. (See Table 6B-5.)

The F score for Composition # 6 (Starer - Samson Agonistes) was 6.958, also significant at the .995 level. Again the low mean response of the "46 - 55" age group differed significantly from the much higher mean responses of the "21 or under" and "22 - 25" age groups. (See Table 6B-6.)

The pattern of responses was fairly consistent for four of the compositions, in that the "46 - 55" age group tended to respond less favorably than did the younger age groups.

TABLE 6B

Age Levels of Auditors - Sixth Concert

Age Level	Number
21 or under	97
22 - 25	24
26 - 35	4
36 - 45	8
46 - 55	23
56 - 65	15
66 or over	5
total	174

TABLE 6B-1

Preference Responses in Terms of Age
Composition # 1 Sixth Concert

F score - 1.024 - significant at the .500 level

AGE GROUP	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
21 or under	12	55	17	11	2	0.6598
22 - 25	4	14	3	2	1	0.7500
26 - 35	1	2	0	1	0	0.7500
36 - 45	0	5	1	2	0	0.3750
46 - 55	4	6	5	6	2	0.1739
56 - 65	2	8	2	1	0	0.8462
66 or over	0	2	1	2	0	0.0000

TABLE 6B-2

Preference Responses in Terms of Age
Composition # 2 Sixth Concert

F score - .621 - not significant

AGE GROUP	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
21 or under	10	33	27	24	3	0.2371
22 - 25	3	13	5	2	1	0.6250
26 - 35	0	1	1	2	0	-0.2500
36 - 45	0	3	3	1	1	0.0000
46 - 55	1	11	4	7	0	0.2609
56 - 65	3	3	4	3	0	0.4615
66 or over	0	1	3	0	1	-0.2000

TABLE 6B-3

Preference Responses in Terms of Age
Composition # 3 Sixth Concert

F score - 1.603 - significant at the .750 level

AGE GROUP	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
21 or under	33	32	16	9	7	0.7732
22 - 25	15	4	4	1	0	1.3750
26 - 35	0	2	2	0	0	0.5000
36 - 45	1	4	1	2	0	0.5000
46 - 55	7	9	2	3	2	0.6957
56 - 65	3	4	0	4	2	0.1538
66 or over	1	3	0	1	0	0.8000

TABLE 6B-4

Preference Responses in Terms of Age
Composition # 4 Sixth Concert

F score - 5.890 - significant at the .995 level

AGE GROUP	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
21 or under	13	36	28	15	5	0.3814
22 - 25	7	7	5	5	0	0.6667
26 - 35	0	0	2	2	0	-0.5000
36 - 45	0	2	2	2	2	-0.5000
46 - 55	0	6	5	12	0	-0.2609
56 - 65	0	2	3	2	6	-0.9231
66 or over	0	0	2	1	2	-1.0000

TABLE 6B-5

Preference Responses in Terms of Age
Composition # 5 Sixth Concert

_F_ score - 2.658 - significant at the .975 level

AGE GROUP	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
21 or under	10	34	30	18	5	0.2680
22 - 25	3	12	4	5	0	0.5417
26 - 35	1	1	0	2	0	0.2500
36 - 45	1	4	2	1	0	0.6250
46 - 55	1	7	3	11	1	-0.1739
56 - 65	0	1	4	6	2	-0.6923
66 or over	0	1	3	1	0	0.0000

TABLE 6B-6

Preference Responses in Terms of Age
Composition # 6 Sixth Concert

_F_ score - 6.958 - significant at the .995 level

AGE GROUP	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
21 or under	66	26	1	3	1	1.5773
22 - 25	16	6	2	0	0	1.5833
26 - 35	1	3	0	0	0	1.2500
36 - 45	4	3	1	0	0	1.3750
46 - 55	8	3	7	4	1	0.5652
56 - 65	1	8	1	0	3	0.3077
66 or over	1	3	0	1	0	0.8000

Analysis of the data in terms of the independent variable, Music Training. Table 6C indicates the distribution of the auditors forming the sample for the Sixth Concert in terms of their formal music training. The first three categories were composed of enough individuals to be of significance in the analysis of the data. However, Categories IV and V included too few auditors to be of any real significance. Hence the significance of the data was viewed with caution when Categories IV and V were involved in significant differences. However, when patterns previously observed in the other five concerts did exist, greater significance was given to the data of the Sixth Concert, as it related to formal music training.

The pattern of mean responses which had been discussed in connection with the preceding concerts did appear in the responses to all six compositions. The tendency of the mean responses to go successively from a lower mean response by those in Category I to a high mean response by the auditors in Category IV, with those in Category V having a lower mean response was evident in varying degrees of clarity for each composition.

Although the responses to Composition # 1 (Smith - Tetrameron) were not significantly different, the mean response pattern mentioned in the previous paragraph was evident. (See Table 6C-1.)

The responses to Composition # 2 (Lombardo - Threnody) yielded an F score of 1.432, significant at the .750 level. Again the pattern of mean responses previously discussed was apparent, although the statistical significance was fairly low, thus limiting its import for this composition. (See Table 6C-2.)

The same held true for the responses to Composition # 3 (Crumb - Variazione). The F score was .838, which was significant at the .500 level. Again the difference was of limited significance. (See Table 6C-3.)

For Composition # 4 (Rochberg - Zodiac) the F score was 1.136, significant also at the .500 level. And again the curve of mean responses was apparent, the significant difference being limited by the small number of auditors making up Category IV. (See Table 6C-4.)

The responses to Composition # 5 (Kraft - Three Pieces) and Composition # 6 (Starer - Samson Agonistes) were not significantly different. (See Tables 6C-5 and 6C-6.)

Although the size of Categories IV and V limited the value of the data, the fact that the curved pattern of mean responses was present to some degree in the responses to each of the six compositions lends credence to the idea that formal music training does have a definite effect on the manner in which auditors react to contemporary American music.

TABLE 6C

Music Training of Auditors - Sixth Concert

MUSIC TRAINING CATEGORY	NUMBER
I	51
II	82
III	25
IV	5
V	11
total	174

TABLE 6C-1

Preference Responses in Terms of Music Training
Composition # 1 Sixth Concert

F score - .763 - not significant

MUSIC TRAINING CATRGORY	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
I	5	25	10	10	1	0.4510
II	12	43	13	11	3	0.6098
III	3	13	6	2	1	0.6000
IV	0	5	0	0	0	1.0000
V	3	6	0	2	0	0.9091

TABLE 6C-2

Preference Responses in Terms of Music Training
Composition # 2 Sixth Concert

F score - 1.432 - significant at the .750 level

MUSIC TRAINING CATEGORY	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
I	4	17	17	9	4	0.1569
II	6	29	22	24	1	0.1829
III	3	12	6	4	0	0.5600
IV	2	2	1	0	0	1.2000
V	2	5	1	2	1	0.4545

TABLE 6C-3

Preference Responses in Terms of Music Training
Composition # 3 Sixth Concert

F score - .838 - significant at the .500 level

MUSIC TRAINING CATEGORY	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
I	16	18	7	6	4	0.7059
II	27	26	13	9	7	0.6951
III	9	9	3	4	0	0.9200
IV	3	2	0	0	0	1.6000
V	5	3	2	1	0	1.0909

TABLE 6C-4

Preference Responses in Terms of Music Training
Composition # 4 Sixth Concert

F score - 1.136 - significant at the .500 level

MUSIC TRAINING CATEGORY	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
I	5	14	12	12	8	-0.0784
II	8	25	27	19	3	0.1951
III	4	8	6	4	3	0.2400
IV	1	3	1	0	0	1.0000
V	2	3	1	4	1	0.0909

TABLE 6C-5

Preference Responses in Terms of Music Training
Composition # 5 Sixth Concert

F score - .217 - not significant

MUSIC TRAINING CATEGORY	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
I	5	17	12	16	1	0.1765
II	9	26	27	16	4	0.2439
III	2	9	4	7	3	0.0000
IV	0	3	1	1	0	0.4000
V	0	5	2	4	0	0.0909

TABLE 6C-6

Preference Responses in Terms of Music Training
Composition # 6 Sixth Concert

F score - .250 - not significant

MUSIC TRAINING CATEGORY	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
I	25	17	3	4	2	1.1569
II	49	21	7	3	2	1.3659
III	12	10	2	0	1	1.2800
IV	4	1	0	0	0	1.8000
V	7	3	0	1	0	1.4545

Analysis of the data in terms of the independent variable, Educational Attainment. Table 6D indicates the distribution of the auditors forming the sample for the Sixth Concert in terms of their Educational Attainment. Two groups, "attended college, didn't graduate" and "college graduate" were large enough to be of significant value in the analysis of the data. Two other groups, "high school graduate" and "received master's degree" were of a size which was of limited value. The other groups were too small to be of use and were included for general information.

The responses to Composition # 1 (Smith - Tetrameron) and Composition # 2 (Lombardo - Threnody) were not significantly different. (See Tables 6D-1 and 6D-2.)

The responses to Composition # 3 (Crumb - Variazione) yielded an F score of .894, which was significant at the .500 level. The high mean response of the "college graduate" group was of limited significance when compared to the lower mean responses of the "high school graduate" and "received master's degree" groups. (See Table 6D-3.)

The F score for Composition # 4 (Rochberg - Zodiac) was 1.138, significant at the .750 level. The negative mean responses of the "high school graduate" and "received master's degree" groups were of a limited significance when compared with the positive mean responses of the "attended college, didn't graduate" and "college graduate" groups. (See Table 6D-4.)

The responses to Composition # 5 (Kraft - Three Pieces) were not significantly different. (See Table 6D-5.)

For Composition # 6 (Starer - Samson Agonistes) the low mean response of the "high school graduate" group differed significantly from the higher mean responses of the other three Educational Attainment groups being considered in the analysis. The F score was 2.891, significant at the .990 level. The small size of the "high school graduate" group limits the significance of the difference. (See Table 6D-6.)

In general, the "attended college, didn't graduate" and "college graduate" groups tended to react more favorably to the music than did those in the "high school graduate" and "received master's degree groups.

TABLE 6D

Educational Attainment of Auditors - Sixth Concert

Educational Attainment	Number
att. h.s., didn't graduate	4
high school graduate	13
att. coll., didn't graduate	103
college graduate	36
received master's degree	14
received doctor's degree	4
total	174

TABLE 6D-1

Preference Responses in Terms of Educational Attainment
Composition # 1 Sixth Concert

F score - .503 - not significant

EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
att. h.s., didn't grad.	1	1	1	1	0	0.5000
high school graduate	2	3	5	1	2	0.1538
att.coll.,didn't grad.	12	58	17	14	2	0.6214
college graduate	7	21	2	5	1	0.7778
rec'd. master's deg.	1	7	2	4	0	0.3571
rec'd. doctor's deg.	0	2	2	0	0	0.5000

TABLE 6D-2

Preference Responses in Terms of Educational Attainment
Composition # 2 Sixth Concert

F score - .463 - not significant

EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
att. h.s.,didn't grad.	0	1	1	2	0	-0.2500
high school graduate	2	5	3	3	0	0.4615
att.coll.,didn't grad.	9	35	32	23	4	0.2136
college graduate	4	15	8	8	1	0.3611
rec'd. master's deg.	1	6	3	3	1	0.2143
rec'd. doctor's deg.	1	3	0	0	0	1.2500

TABLE 6D-3

Preference Responses in Terms of Educational Attainment
Composition # 3 Sixth Concert

F score - .894 - significant at the .500 level

EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
att.h.s.,didn't grad.	1	1	1	1	0	0.5000
high school graduate	4	4	0	3	2	0.3846
att.coll,,didn't grad.	33	36	16	10	8	0.7379
college graduate	18	11	4	2	1	1.1944
rec'd. master's deg.	3	4	4	3	0	0.5000
rec'd. doctor's deg.	1	2	0	1	0	0.7500

TABLE 6D-4

Preference Responses in Terms of Educational Attainment
Composition # 4 Sixth Concert

F score - 1.138 - significant at the .750 level

EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
att.h.s.,didn't grad.	1	0	1	2	0	0.0000
high school graduate	0	4	4	5	0	-0.0769
att.coll.,didn't grad.	12	36	31	16	8	0.2718
college graduate	7	10	6	9	4	0.1944
rec'd. master's deg.	0	2	3	7	2	-0.6429
rec'd. doctor's deg.	0	1	2	0	1	-0.2500

TABLE 6D-5

Preference Responses in Terms of Educational Attainment
Composition # 5 Sixth Concert

F score - .288 - not significant

EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
att.h.s.,didn't grad.	1	0	2	1	0	0.2500
high school graduate	3	4	2	4	0	0.4615
att.coll.,didn't grad.	10	36	31	19	7	0.2233
college graduate	2	15	5	14	0	0.1389
rec'd. master's deg.	0	4	5	5	0	-0.0714
rec'd. doctor's deg.	0	1	1	1	1	-0.5000

TABLE 6D-6

Preference Responses in Terms of Educational Attainment
Composition # 6 Sixth Concert

F score - 2.891 - significant at the .990 level

EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
att.h.s.,didn't grad.	2	0	1	1	0	0.7500
high school graduate	5	3	3	0	2	0.6923
att.coll.,didn't grad.	66	28	3	4	2	1.4757
college graduate	19	13	2	2	0	1.3611
rec'd. master's deg.	4	7	3	0	0	1.0714
rec'd. doctor's deg.	1	1	0	1	1	0.0000

Analysis of the data in terms of the independent variable, Familiarity. Tables 6E-1 through 6E-6 list the preference responses to the Familiarity Scale for the six compositions of the Sixth Concert. The responses to the Familiarity Scale for each composition were heavily skewed towards unfamiliarity. In every case the number of auditors forming the "familiarity" and "not sure" groups were too small to be of any real value in determining the effect of familiarity towards the preference response of the auditor. However, it should be noted, that in the case of every composition performed at the Sixth Concert, those who indicated "familiarity" or "not sure" collectively reacted more favorably to each composition than did those who were significantly higher. The auditors who responded to the compositions performed at the Sixth Concert were the only sample who reacted in this manner. So some consideration must be given to the idea that familiarity does affect the manner in which the auditor does indicate his aesthetic attitudes in terms of preference or lack of preference.

See Tables 6E-1 through 6E-6 for specific F scores and resultant levels of significance.

TABLE 6E-1

Preference Responses in Terms of Familiarity
Composition # 1 Sixth Concert

F score - 2.072 - significant at the .750 level

DEGREE OF FAMILIARITY	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
Familiar A (14)	4	7	1	2	0	0.9286
Not sure B (12)	1	10	1	0	0	1.0000
Unfamiliar C (148)	18	75	27	23	5	0.5270

TABLE 6E-2

Preference Responses in Terms of Familiarity
Composition # 2 Sixth Concert

F score - 1.910 - significant at the .750 level

DEGREE OF FAMILIARITY	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
Familiar A (10)	2	5	1	1	1	0.6000
Not sure B (13)	2	6	5	0	0	0.7692
Unfamiliar C (151)	13	54	41	38	5	0.2119

TABLE 6E-3

Preference Responses in Terms of Familiarity
Composition # 3 Sixth Concert

F score - 1.009 - significant at the .500 level

DEGREE OF FAMILIARITY	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
Familiar A (13)	5	6	2	0	0	1.2308
Not sure B (9)	2	5	1	0	1	0.7778
Unfamiliar C (152)	53	47	22	20	10	0.7434

TABLE 6E-4

Preference Responses in Terms of Familiarity
Composition # 4 Sixth Concert

F score - 1.908 - significant at the .750 level

DEGREE OF FAMILIARITY	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
Familiar A (8)	2	4	1	1	0	0.8750
Not sure B (12)	1	6	2	3	0	0.4167
Unfamiliar C (154)	17	43	44	35	15	0.0779

TABLE 6E-5

Preference Responses in Terms of Familiarity
Composition # 5 Sixth Concert

F score - 4.621 - significant at the .990 level

DEGREE OF FAMILIARITY	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
Familiar A (7)	2	4	0	1	0	1.0000
Not sure B (9)	3	2	4	0	0	0.8889
Unfamiliar C (158)	11	54	42	43	8	0.1076

TABLE 6E-6

Preference Responses in Terms of Familiarity
Composition # 6 Sixth Concert

F score - 3.128 - significant at the .950 level

DEGREE OF FAMILIARITY	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean
Familiar A (14)	11	3	0	0	0	1.7857
Not sure B (17)	11	6	0	0	0	1.6471
Unfamiliar C (146)	75	43	12	8	8	1.2238

Analysis of the data in terms of preference responses. Table 6F indicates the summary of preference responses to each composition performed at the Sixth Concert. In all cases except one, the responses to the various works were found to be significantly different.

A comparison of the responses to Composition # 4 (Rochberg - Zodiac) and Composition # 5 (Kraft - Three Pieces) yielded a *t* score of .409, which was not significant. The stylistic idiom of these two works was similar. They both featured a sparse orchestration with few doublings, considerable brass writing (often muted), much percussion, extreme registers, etc. Statistically it cannot be stated with validity that the responses to the two compositions were similar. However, it is of importance that the responses to the two works did not differ significantly.

The comparison of the preference responses to each composition with the responses to every other composition yielded *t* scores which were significant at the .995 level, with the following exceptions: Between Composition # 2 (Lombardo - Threnody) and Composition # 4 (Rochberg - Zodiac) the *t* score was 1.240, significant at the .750 level: between Composition # 2 and Composition # 5 (Kraft - Three Pieces) the *t* score was [illegible], also significant at the .750 level; and between Composition # 1 (Smith - Tetrameron) and Composition # 3 (Crumb - Variazione) the *t* score was 1.691, which was significant at the .950 level.

It is important to note that the responses of the auditors at both the Fifth and Sixth Concerts either were not significantly different, or were of only a limited significant difference when the responses to Composition # 2 (Lombardo - Threnody), Composition # 4 (Rochberg - Zodiac) and Composition # 5 (Kraft - Three Pieces) were compared. For the other three compositions the differences in responses tended to be more significant at the Sixth Concert than they were at the Fifth Concert.

And with this in mind, it should be noted that the auditors who formed the sample at the Fifth Concert appeared to be somewhat more sophisticated than were those who formed the sample at the Sixth Concert.

TABLE 6F

Summary of Preference Responses for each Composition
Sixth Concert

COMPOSITION	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean	Standard Deviation
1	23	92	29	25	5	0.5920	0.9800
2	17	65	47	39	6	0.2759	1.0200
3	60	58	25	20	11	0.7816	1.2100
4	20	53	47	39	15	0.1379	1.1400
5	16	60	46	44	8	0.1839	1.0500
6	97	52	12	8	5	1.3103	0.9800

Analysis of the responses to the Index of Stylistic Characteristics. The responses to the Index of Stylistic Characteristics were examined in relation to the stylistic analyses of the compositions performed. (See Appendix I for the complete stylistic analyses of the works performed at the Sixth Concert.)

As was the case at the Fifth Concert, at least fifty percent of the auditors at the Sixth Concert selected three characteristics as being present in each composition. Therefore the summaries of characteristics show the frequency of first, second, and third choices, as well as the total frequency of selections. The sum is an indication of the relative significance of selection. A first choice was weighted more heavily than a second or third choice. Hence the sum of weighted choices was the most appropriate means of determining the relative significance of each characteristic from the standpoint of the auditors.

In general the auditors at the Sixth Concert tended to select the same characteristics as being most important in each composition as did their counterparts at the Fifth Concert. The frequency of selection was not always the same and they tended to emphasize certain characteristics more or less than did the auditors at the Fifth Concert, but there was still a consistent pattern that was readily evident. For the sake of a ready comparison those characteristids selected by the auditors at the Sixth Concert as being most important, which were also selected by the auditors at the Fifth Concert, will be marked with an asterisk (*).

Tables 6G-1 through 6G-6 contain the summary of responses for Composition # 1 (Smith - Tetrameron). (The overall summary is contained in Table 6G-1 and the listings in terms of formal music training are contained in the other tables.) The auditors at the Sixth Concert placed a little more emphasis on music characteristics as a first choice than did those at the Fifth Concert. Forty-two percent selected mood characteristics while fifty percent selected music characteristics. And, as in the case of the responses of the auditors at the Fifth Concerts, the auditors at the Sixth Concert gave very little emphasis to mood characteristics as second and third choices, rather tending to stress music characteristics.

Eight mood characteristics were selected at least once, with four being selected with a significant frequency. The four were, in the order of frequency of selection:

7. dramatic, agitated, exciting, triumphant
2.* heavy, gloomy, pathetic
4.* quiet, lyrical, satisfying, calm
3.* sentimental, tender, pleading

There was not the same consistency of agreement as to mood evidenced by those at the Sixth Concert as was found at the Fifth Concert. The mood characteristic "7" presents a picture which can be readily contrasted with the other three.

28 music characteristics were selected at least once. Five music characteristics, all judged to be present in the work, were mentioned frequently enough to be considered significant. They were, in order of frequency of selection:

9.* irregular melodic contour, disjointed (angular)
27.* strange orchestral color
29.* string instrument color
14.* dissonant sounds
10.* lyric melody

Although the styles analysts determined that "lyric melody" was a more prevalent characteristic than "irregular melodic contour", the auditors at the Sixth Concert placed about twice as much emphasis on "irregular melodic contour" as they did on "lyric melody." (The only characteristic considered significant by the auditors at the Fifth Concert which was not adjudged the same importance by those at the Sixth Concert was "orderliness of structure" '18'.)

TABLE 6G-1

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 1 Sixth Concert
Overall Summary

CHARACTERISTIC NO.		CHOICES			
	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS					
1	5	4	1	10	24
2	20	-	1	21	61
3	9	7	1	17	42
4	19	1	1	21	60
5	-	2	2	4	6
6	-	1	-	1	2
7	16	6	4	26	64
8	4	3	-	7	18
Totals	73	24	10	107	277
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS					
Pervading Characteristics					
10	4	14	3	21	43
18	1	3	4	8	13
Totals	5	17	7	29	56
Significant Characteristics					
15	1	1	2	4	7
21	1	3	4	8	13
26	4	7	3	14	29
28	1	3	3	7	12
29	6	15	12	33	60
34	-	-	1	1	1
Totals	13	29	25	67	122

TABLE 6G-1 (continued)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS (continued)					
Peripheral Characteristics					
9	18	11	5	34	81
13	2	4	5	11	19
14	8	12	9	29	57
16	2	5	3	10	19
23	3	2	4	9	17
25	1	2	3	6	10
27	13	13	13	39	78
31	2	3	6	11	18
32	3	3	2	8	17
36	-	1	2	3	4
37	-	-	3	3	3
Totals	52	56	55	163	323
Characteristics not related					
11	5	1	4	10	21
12	1	-	-	1	3
17	7	3	5	15	32
19	2	5	5	12	21
20	-	-	2	2	2
24	1	1	-	2	5
30	-	-	1	1	1
33	-	2	1	3	5
35	1	2	6	9	13
Totals	17	14	24	55	103
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES					
Mood Characteristics	73	24	10	107	277
% of total	(42.0)	(13.8)	(5.7)	(20.5)	(26.5)
Music Characteristics	87	116	111	314	604
% of total	(50.0)	(66.7)	(63.8)	(60.2)	(57.9)
No. of no responses	14	34	53	101	163
% of total	(8.0)	(19.5)	(30.5)	(19.3)	(15.6)

TABLE 6G-2

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 1 Sixth Concert
Auditors in Music Training Category I

		CHOICES			
CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS					
1	1	1	1	3	6
2	8	-	1	9	25
3	2	3	-	5	12
4	5	-	-	5	15
5	-	1	2	3	4
6	-	1	-	1	2
7	3	3	3	9	18
8	3	1	-	4	11
Totals	22	10	6	39	93
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS					
Pervading Characteristics					
10	2	3	-	5	12
18	1	1	-	2	5
Totals	3	4	-	7	17
Significant Characteristics					
15	1	1	-	2	5
21	-	2	1	3	5
26	-	2	2	4	6
28	-	-	1	1	1
29	-	5	4	9	14
Totals	1	10	8	19	31
Peripheral Characteristics					
9	3	5	1	9	20
13	-	1	1	2	3
14	2	-	-	2	6
16	-	1	-	1	2
23	-	-	1	1	1
25	-	-	2	2	2
27	8	2	3	13	31
31	-	-	2	2	2
32	1	-	-	1	3
36	-	-	1	1	1
Totals	14	9	11	34	71

TABLE 6G-2 (continued)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS (continued)					
Characteristics not related					
11	2	1	2	5	10
17	1	2	2	5	9
19	2	-	-	2	6
20	-	-	1	1	1
33	-	1	-	1	2
35	1	1	-	2	5
Totals	6	5	5	16	33
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES					
Mood Characteristics	22	10	7	39	93
% of total	(43.1)	(19.6)	(13.7)	(25.5)	(30.4)
Music Characteristics	24	28	24	76	152
% of total	(47.1)	(54.9)	(47.1)	(49.7)	(49.7)
No. of no responses	5	13	20	38	61
% of total	(9.8)	(25.5)	(39.2)	(24.8)	(19.9)

TABLE 6G-3

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 1 Sixth Concert
Auditors in Music Training Category II

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	CHOICES Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS					
1	3	3	-	6	15
2	11	-	-	11	33
3	3	2	-	5	13
4	6	1	1	8	21
7	11	3	-	14	39
8	1	1	-	2	5
Totals	35	10	1	46	126

TABLE 6G-3 (continued)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS					
Pervading Characteristics					
10	1	5	2	8	15
18	-	-	1	1	1
Totals	1	5	3	9	16
Significant Characteristics					
21	1	1	2	4	7
26	3	2	-	5	13
28	1	3	1	5	10
29	4	7	5	16	31
34	-	-	1	1	1
Totals	9	13	9	31	62
Peripheral Characteristics					
9	8	4	4	16	36
13	1	1	4	6	9
14	3	7	5	15	28
16	1	2	2	5	9
23	1	1	3	5	8
25	-	2	-	2	4
27	4	8	9	21	37
31	1	3	1	5	10
32	2	3	2	7	14
36	-	1	1	2	3
37	-	-	2	2	2
Totals	21	32	33	86	160
Characteristics not related					
11	2	-	2	4	8
12	1	-	-	1	3
17	4	1	1	6	15
19	-	4	3	7	11
24	1	1	-	2	5
30	-	-	1	1	1
33	-	1	-	1	2
35	-	-	4	4	4
Totals	8	7	11	26	49

TABLE 6G-3 (continued)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES					
Mood Characteristics	35	10	1	46	126
% of total	(42.7)	(12.2)	(1.2)	(18.7)	(25.6)
Music Characteristics	39	57	56	152	287
% of total	(47.6)	(69.5)	(68.3)	(61.8)	(58.3)
No. of no responses	8	15	25	48	79
% of total	(9.7)	(18.3)	(30.5)	(19.5)	(16.1)

TABLE 6G-4

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 1 Sixth Concert
Auditors in Music Training Category III

		CHOICES			
CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS					
1	1	-	-	1	3
2	1	-	-	1	3
3	2	2	-	4	10
4	4	-	-	4	12
5	-	1	-	1	2
7	2	-	1	3	7
Totals	10	3	1	14	37
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS					
Pervading Characteristics					
10	-	3	1	4	7
18	-	1	1	2	3
Totals	-	4	2	6	10
Significant Characteristics					
29	1	2	3	6	10
Totals	1	2	3	6	10

TABLE 6G-4 (continued)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS (continued)					
Peripheral Characteristics					
9	5	1	-	6	17
13	-	1	-	1	2
14	1	3	3	7	12
16	1	2	-	3	7
23	2	1	-	3	8
25	1	-	-	1	3
27	1	2	1	4	8
31	-	-	3	3	3
37	-	-	1	1	1
Totals	11	10	8	29	61
Characteristics not related					
11	1	-	-	1	3
17	2	-	2	4	8
20	-	-	1	1	1
33	-	-	1	1	1
35	-	1	1	2	3
Totals	3	1	5	9	16
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES					
Mood Characteristics	10	3	1	14	37
% of total	(40.0)	(12.0)	(4.0)	(18.7)	(24.7)
Music Characteristics	15	17	18	50	97
% of total	(60.0)	(68.0)	(72.0)	(66.7)	(64.7)
No. of no responses	-	5	6	11	16
% of total	(00.0)	(20.0)	(24.0)	(14.6)	(10.6)

TABLE 6G-5

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 1 Sixth Concert
Auditors in Music Training Category IV

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	CHOICES				
	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS					
3	1	-	-	1	3
4	2	-	-	2	6
Totals	3	-	-	3	9
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS					
Pervading Characteristics					
10	-	1	-	1	2
18	-	-	2	2	2
Totals	-	1	2	3	4
Significant Characteristics					
26	-	2	-	2	4
Totals	-	2	-	2	4
Peripheral Characteristics					
9	1	1	-	2	5
13	-	1	-	1	2
14	-	-	1	1	1
16	-	-	1	1	1
31	1	-	-	1	3
Totals	2	2	2	6	12
Characteristics not related					
19	-	-	1	1	1
Totals	-	-	1	1	1
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES					
Mood Characteristics	3	-	-	3	9
% of total	(60.0)	(00.0)	(00.0)	(20.0)	(30.0)
Music Characteristics	2	5	5	12	21
% of total	(40.0)	(100.0)	(100.0)	(80.0)	(70.0)
No. of no responses	-	-	-	-	-
% of total	(00.0)	(00.0)	(00.0)	(00.0)	(00.0)

TABLE 6G-6

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 1 Sixth Concert
Auditors in Music Training Category V

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	CHOICES First	 Second	 Third	 Total	 Sum
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS					
3	1	-	1	2	4
4	2	-	-	2	6
8	-	1	-	1	2
Totals	3	1	1	5	12
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS					
Pervading Characteristics					
10	1	2	-	3	7
18	-	1	-	1	2
Totals	1	3	-	4	9
Significant Characteristics					
15	-	-	2	2	2
21	-	-	1	1	1
26	1	1	1	3	6
28	-	-	1	1	1
29	1	1	-	2	5
Totals	2	2	5	9	15
Peripheral Characteristics					
9	1	-	-	1	3
13	1	-	-	1	3
14	2	2	-	4	10
25	-	-	1	1	1
27	-	1	-	1	2
Totals	4	3	1	8	19
Characteristics not related					
19	-	1	1	2	3
35	-	-	1	1	1
Totals	-	1	2	3	4

TABLE 6G-6 (continued)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES					
Mood Characteristics	3	1	1	5	12
% of total	(27.3)	(9.1)	(9.1)	(15.2)	(18.2)
Music Characteristics	7	9	8	24	47
% of total	(63.6)	(81.8)	(72.7)	(72.7)	(71.2)
No. of no responses	1	1	2	4	7
% of total	(9.1)	(9.1)	(13.2)	(12.1)	(10.6)

Tables 6G-7 through 6G-12 contain the summary of responses for Composition # 2 (Lombardo - Threnody). (The overall summary is contained in Table 6G-7, and the listings in terms of formal music training are found in the other tables.) The program notes for Composition # 2 specified that the mood was "sorrowful." That the auditors at the Sixth Concert responded to the suggestion (as did those at the Fifth Concert) was evidenced by the emphasis placed upon mood characteristics as a first choice. However, the emphasis switched to music characteristics for second and third choices.

Five mood characteristics were selected with four having a significant frequency of selection. They were, in the order of frequency:

2.* heavy, gloomy, pathetic
3.* sentimental, tender, pleading
1.* spiritual, serious, inspiring
4.* quiet, lyrical, satisfying, calm

The mood characteristic most closely associated with the "sorrowful" mood indicated in the program notes was mood "2" and this mood was selected about as often as the other three combined. Therefore, the program notes did have an effect on the manner in which the auditors responded to affective mood. (The auditors at the Fifth Concert selected the same mood characteristics in the same order of frequency as did those at the Sixth Concert.)

26 music characteristics were selected at least once. Of this number only five were selected with enough frequency to be considered significant. They

were, in the order of frequency of selection:

- 29.* string instrument color (also selected most frequently by the auditors at the Fifth Concert)
- 21.* interweaving of melodies (contrapuntal)
- 14. dissonant sounds
- 9.* irregular melodic contour, disjointed (angular)
- 10.* lyric melody

Although "lyric melody" was judged by the styles analysts to be more important than "irregular melodic contour" the auditors placed about the same emphasis on both characteristics. (Auditors at the Fifth Concert also emphasized '23' - "extreme pitch ranges.")

TABLE 6G-7

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 2 Sixth Concert
Overall Summary

	CHOICES				
CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS					
1	17	13	3	33	80
2	53	16	10	79	201
3	23	10	7	40	96
4	10	5	0	15	40
8	-	2	1	3	5
Totals	103	46	21	170	422
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS					
Pervading Characteristics					
18	1	1	2	4	7
21	13	8	3	24	58
29	19	23	16	58	119
Totals	33	32	21	86	184

TABLE 6G-7 (continued)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS (continued)					
Significant Characteristics					
10	4	6	7	17	31
14	3	10	8	21	37
15	-	1	2	3	4
26	-	7	9	16	23
35	1	2	5	8	12
Totals	8	26	31	65	107
Peripheral Characteristics					
9	5	8	2	15	33
12	1	1	1	3	6
13	-	2	-	2	4
16	1	-	2	3	5
20	-	-	2	2	2
23	1	4	5	10	16
37	1	6	4	11	19
Totals	9	21	16	46	85
Characteristics not related					
11	3	6	3	12	24
17	3	4	6	13	23
19	-	3	1	4	7
22	-	-	1	1	1
24	-	-	1	1	1
27	1	4	1	6	12
28	3	-	-	3	9
31	-	1	1	2	3
32	-	-	1	1	1
34	1	1	2	4	7
36	-	-	1	1	1
Totals	11	19	18	48	89
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES					
Mood Characteristics	103	46	21	170	422
% of total	(59.2)	(26.4)	(12.1)	(32.6)	(40.4)
Music Characteristics	61	98	86	245	465
% of total	(35.1)	(56.3)	(49.4)	(46.9)	(44.5)
No. of no responses	10	30	67	107	157
% of total	(5.7)	(17.3)	(38.5)	(20.5)	(15.1)

TABLE 6G-8

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 2 Sixth Concert
Auditors in Music Training Category I

		CHOICES			
CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS					
1	8	7	1	16	39
2	19	3	1	23	64
3	4	2	1	7	17
4	4	2	-	6	16
8	-	2	-	2	4
Totals	35	16	3	54	140
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS					
Pervading Characteristics					
18	-	1	1	2	3
21	1	1	-	2	5
29	4	4	5	13	25
Totals	5	6	6	17	33
Significant Characteristics					
10	1	1	-	2	5
14	-	2	-	2	4
15	-	-	1	1	1
26	-	2	4	6	8
Totals	1	5	5	11	18
Peripheral Characteristics					
9	1	3	-	4	9
20	-	-	1	1	1
23	1	-	1	2	4
37	-	2	2	4	6
Totals	2	5	4	11	20

TABLE 6G-8 (continued)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS (continued)					
Characteristics not related					
11	-	2	1	3	5
17	3	1	1	5	12
19	-	1	-	1	2
22	-	-	1	1	1
24	-	-	1	1	1
27	-	1	-	1	2
34	-	1	1	2	3
Totals	3	6	5	14	26
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES					
Mood Characteristics	35	16	3	54	140
% of total	(68.6)	(31.4)	(5.9)	(35.3)	(45.8)
Music Characteristics	11	22	20	53	97
% of total	(21.6)	(43.1)	(39.2)	(34.6)	(31.7)
No. of no responses	5	13	28	46	69
% of total	(9.8)	(25.5)	(54.9)	(30.1)	(22.5)

TABLE 6G-9

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 2 Sixth Concert
Auditors in Music Training Category II

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	CHOICES First	 Second	 Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS					
1	6	4	1	11	27
2	25	9	5	39	98
3	12	3	3	18	45
4	4	2	-	6	16
8	-	-	1	1	1
Totals	47	18	10	75	187

TABLE 6G-9 (continued)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS					
Pervading Characteristics					
18	1	-	-	1	3
21	8	4	3	15	35
29	8	14	4	26	56
Totals	17	18	7	42	94
Significant Characteristics					
10	1	1	1	3	6
14	1	6	4	11	19
15	-	1	-	1	2
26	-	3	4	7	10
35	1	2	5	8	12
Totals	3	13	14	30	49
Peripheral Characteristics					
9	2	2	1	5	11
12	-	1	1	2	3
13	-	1	-	1	2
16	1	-	2	3	5
20	-	-	1	1	1
23	-	2	3	5	7
37	-	1	1	2	3
Totals	3	7	9	19	32
Characteristics not related					
11	3	3	1	7	16
17	-	2	4	6	8
19	-	1	1	2	3
27	-	3	1	4	7
28	3	-	-	3	9
31	-	1	1	2	3
34	1	-	1	2	4
36	-	-	1	1	1
Totals	7	10	10	27	51

TABLE 6G-9 (continued)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES					
Mood Characteristics	47	18	10	75	187
% of total	(57.3)	(22.0)	(12.2)	(30.5)	(38.0)
Music Characteristics	30	48	40	118	226
% of total	(36.6)	(58.5)	(48.8)	(48.0)	(45.9)
No. of no responses	5	16	32	53	79
% of total	(6.1)	(19.5)	(39.0)	(21.5)	(16.1)

TABLE 6G-10

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 2 Sixth Concert
Auditors in Music Training Category III

		CHOICES			
CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS					
1	2	1	-	3	8
2	7	2	2	11	27
3	3	4	3	10	20
4	2	1	-	3	8
Totals	14	8	5	27	63
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS					
Pervading Characteristics					
18	-	-	1	1	1
21	2	1	-	3	8
29	5	3	5	13	26
Totals	7	4	6	17	35
Significant Characteristics					
10	1	2	3	6	10
14	2	1	-	3	8
15	-	-	1	1	1
26	-	2	1	3	5
Totals	3	5	5	13	24

TABLE 6G-10 (continued)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS (continued)					
Peripheral Characteristics					
9	-	1	-	1	2
13	-	1	-	1	2
23	-	2	1	3	5
37	1	2	1	4	8
Totals	1	6	2	9	17
Characteristics not related					
11	-	1	1	2	3
32	-	-	1	1	1
Totals	-	1	2	3	4
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES					
Mood Characteristics	14	8	5	27	63
% of total	(56.0)	(32.0)	(20.0)	(36.0)	(42.0)
Music Characteristics	11	16	15	42	80
% of total	(44.0)	(64.0)	(60.0)	(56.0)	(53.3)
No. of no responses	-	1	5	6	7
% of total	(00.0)	(4.0)	(20.0)	(8.0)	(4.7)

TABLE 6G-11

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 2 Sixth Concert
Auditors in Music Training Category IV

	CHOICES				
CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS					
1	-	1	-	1	2
2	-	-	1	1	1
3	3	-	-	3	9
Totals	3	1	1	5	12

TABLE 6G-11 (continued)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS					
Pervading Characteristics					
21	-	1	-	1	2
29	1	1	-	2	5
Totals	1	2	-	3	7
Significant Characteristics					
10	-	1	1	2	3
14	-	-	1	1	1
Totals	-	1	2	3	4
Peripheral Characteristics					
9	1	1	-	2	5
Totals	1	1	-	2	5
Characteristics not related	N O N E				
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES					
Mood Characteristics	3	1	1	5	12
% of total	(60.0)	(20.0)	(20.0)	(33.3)	(40.0)
Music Characteristics	2	4	2	8	16
% of total	(40.0)	(80.0)	(40.0)	(53.3)	(53.3)
No. of nc responses	-	-	2	2	2
% of total	(00.0)	(00.0)	(40.0)	(13.4)	(6.7)

TABLE 6G-12

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics

Composition # 2 Sixth Concert

Auditors in Music Training Category V

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	CHOICES First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS					
1	1	-	1	2	4
2	2	2	1	5	11
3	1	1	-	2	5
Totals	4	3	2	9	20

TABLE 6G-12 (continued)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS					
Pervading Characteristics					
21	2	1	-	3	8
29	1	1	2	4	7
Totals	3	2	2	7	15
Significant Characteristics					
10	1	1	2	4	7
14	-	1	3	4	5
Totals	1	2	5	8	12
Peripheral Characteristics					
9	1	1	1	3	6
12	1	-	-	1	3
37	-	1	-	1	2
Totals	2	2	1	5	11
Characteristics not related					
17	-	1	1	2	3
19	-	1	-	1	2
27	1	-	-	1	3
Totals	1	2	1	4	8
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES					
Mood Characteristics	4	3	2	9	20
% of total	(36.4)	(27.3)	(18.2)	(27.3)	(30.3)
Music Characteristics	7	8	9	24	46
% of total	(63.6)	(72.7)	(81.8)	(72.7)	(69.7)
No. of no responses	-	-	-	-	-
% of total	(00.0)	(00.0)	(00.0)	(00.0)	(00.0)

Tables 6G-13 through 6G-18 contain the summary of responses for Composition # 3 (Crumb - Variazione). (The overall summary is contained in Table 6G-13, and the listings in terms of formal music training are found in the remaining tables.) There was little difference in the emphasis on mood and music characteristics between the auditors at the Fifth and Sixth Concerts. Both stressed music characteristics in their first, second, and third choices. There was also general agreement in terms of the most significant mood characteristic. At both concerts only one mood characteristic was mentioned with enough frequency to be considered significant. It was "dramatic, agitated, exciting, triumphant" (7). All eight mood characteristics were selected at least once.

27 music characteristics were selected at least once. There was considerable diversity in the selection of music characteristics, however, six characteristics were selected with such frequency as to be considered significant. They were, in the order of frequency:

31.* dynamic contrast of the music
27.* strange orchestral effects
9.* irregular melodic contour, disjointed (angular)
19.* disjointed series of sounds, (pointillistic)
14.* dissonant sounds
32.* percussion color

Again the auditors generally were in agreement with those at the Fifth Concert. One music characteristic, "cluttered texture, busy music" (25), which was considered important by the auditors at the Fifth Concert, did not receive the same emphasis by the auditors at the Sixth Concert.

TABLE 6G-13

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 3 Sixth oncert
Overall Summary

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	CHOICES First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS					
1	2	1	-	3	8
2	5	-	2	7	17
3	1	-	-	1	3
4	2	-	-	2	6
5	1	-	3	4	6
6	2	6	-	8	18
7	30	15	13	58	133
8	5	6	2	13	29
Totals	48	28	20	96	220
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS					
Pervading Characteristics					
18	2	1	1	4	9
20	2	1	-	3	8
27	14	11	18	43	82
31	19	13	8	40	91
Totals	37	26	27	90	190
Significant Characteristics					
9	12	11	14	37	72
11	1	3	2	6	11
14	5	15	10	30	55
16	4	1	3	8	17
23	1	5	6	12	19
26	-	1	-	1	2
28	3	1	-	4	11
29	3	7	5	15	28
32	5	10	14	29	49
33	1	1	2	4	7
34	1	2	2	5	9
35	-	4	-	4	8
36	2	3	6	11	18
37	-	1	1	2	3
Totals	38	65	65	168	309

TABLE 6G-13 (continued)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS (continued)					
Peripheral Characteristics					
12	-	-	1	1	1
19	16	9	3	28	69
25	2	8	3	13	25
Totals	18	17	7	42	95
Characteristics not related					
10	-	1	1	2	3
13	3	-	1	4	10
17	4	3	4	11	22
21	1	3	1	5	10
24	4	1	-	5	14
30	2	-	1	3	7
Totals	14	8	8	30	66
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES					
Mood Characteristics	48	28	20	96	220
% of total	(27.6)	(16.1)	(11.5)	(18.4)	(21.1)
Music Characteristics	107	116	107	330	660
% of total	(61.5)	(66.7)	(61.5)	(63.2)	(63.2)
No. of no responses	19	30	47	96	164
% of total	(10.9)	(17.2)	(27.0)	(18.4)	(15.7)

TABLE 6G-14

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 3 Sixth Concert
Auditors in Music Training Category I

		CHOICES			
CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS					
1	1	-	-	1	3
5	-	-	1	1	1
6	1	4	-	5	11
7	18	2	2	22	60
8	2	1	-	3	8
Totals	22	7	3	32	83
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS					
Pervading Characteristics					
27	2	2	5	9	15
31	6	4	1	11	27
Totals	8	6	6	20	42
Significant Characteristics					
9	5	3	5	13	26
11	-	-	1	1	1
14	2	2	1	5	11
16	-	-	1	1	1
23	-	1	3	4	5
28	2	1	-	3	8
29	-	-	1	1	1
32	1	3	8	11	16
33	-	-	1	1	1
34	-	1	-	1	2
35	-	3	-	3	6
36	-	3	1	4	7
37	-	1	-	1	2
Totals	10	18	21	49	87
Peripheral Characteristics					
19	2	5	1	8	17
25	-	1	1	2	3
Totals	2	6	2	10	20

TABLE 6G-14 (continued)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS (continued)					
Characteristics not related					
13	1	-	-	1	3
17	1	2	3	6	10
21	-	1	-	1	2
Totals	2	3	3	8	15
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES					
Mood Characteristics	22	7	3	32	83
% of total	(43.1)	(13.7)	(5.9)	(20.9)	(27.1)
Music Characteristics	22	33	32	87	164
% of total	(43.1)	(64.7)	(62.7)	(56.9)	(53.6)
No. of no responses	7	11	16	34	59
% of total	(13.8)	(21.6)	(31.4)	(22.2)	(19.3)

TABLE 6G-15

Summary of Responses of Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 3 Sixth Concert
Auditors in Music Training Category II

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	CHOICES First	 Second	 Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS					
1	1	-	-	1	3
2	5	-	1	6	16
3	1	-	-	1	3
4	1	-	-	1	3
5	-	-	1	1	1
6	1	2	-	3	7
7	9	8	7	24	50
8	2	4	1	7	15
Totals	20	14	10	44	98

TABLE 6G-15 (continued)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS					
Pervading Characteristics					
18	1	-	-	1	3
27	5	4	7	16	30
31	8	7	6	21	44
Totals	14	11	13	38	77
Significant Characteristics					
9	5	7	5	17	34
11	1	2	1	4	8
14	2	6	6	14	24
16	4	1	2	7	16
23	1	2	1	4	8
28	1	-	-	1	3
29	1	6	2	9	17
32	3	3	4	10	19
33	1	-	1	2	4
34	1	1	1	3	6
35	-	1	-	1	2
36	1	-	5	6	8
37	-	-	1	1	1
Totals	21	29	29	79	150
Peripheral Characteristics					
19	9	2	-	11	31
25	-	5	1	6	11
Totals	9	7	1	17	42
Characteristics not related					
13	1	-	1	2	4
17	3	1	1	5	12
21	1	2	-	3	7
24	2	1	-	3	8
30	-	-	1	1	1
Totals	7	4	3	14	32

TABLE 6G-15 (continued)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES					
Mood Characteristics	20	14	10	44	98
% of total	(24.4)	(17.1)	(12.2)	(17.9)	(19.9)
Music Characteristics	51	51	46	148	301
% of total	(62.2)	(62.2)	(56.1)	(60.2)	(61.2)
No. of no responses	11	17	26	54	93
% of total	(13.4)	(20.7)	(31.7)	(22.0)	(18.9)

TABLE 6G-16

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 3 Sixth Concert
Auditors in Music Training Category III

		CHOICES			
CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS					
2	-	-	1	1	1
5	1	-	1	2	4
7	1	4	3	8	14
8	1	1	-	2	5
Totals	3	5	5	13	24
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS					
Pervading Characteristics					
18	-	1	1	2	3
20	1	1	-	2	5
27	4	3	2	9	20
31	4	1	1	6	15
Totals	9	6	4	19	43

TABLE 6G-16 (continued)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS (continued)					
Significant Characteristics					
9	1	-	3	4	6
11	-	1	-	1	2
14	1	4	1	6	12
23	-	2	1	3	5
29	2	1	2	5	10
32	1	3	2	6	11
36	1	-	-	1	3
Totals	6	11	9	26	49
Peripheral Characteristics					
12	-	-	1	1	1
19	4	-	2	6	14
25	1	2	1	4	8
Totals	5	2	4	11	23
Characteristics not related					
21	-	-	1	1	1
24	1	-	-	1	3
30	1	-	-	1	3
Totals	2	-	1	3	7
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES					
Mood Characteristics	3	5	5	13	24
% of total	(12.0)	(20.0)	(20.0)	(17.3)	(16.0)
Music Characteristics	22	19	18	59	122
% of total	(88.0)	(76.0)	(72.0)	(78.7)	(81.3)
No. of no responses	-	1	2	3	4
% of total	(00.0)	(4.0)	(8.0)	(4.0)	(2.7)

TABLE 6G-17

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 3 Sixth Concert
Auditors in Music Training Category IV

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	CHOICES First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS					
1	-	1	-	1	2
4	1	-	-	1	3
7	2	-	1	3	7
Totals	3	1	1	5	12
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS					
Pervading Characteristics					
27	1	-	1	2	4
31	-	1	-	1	2
Totals	1	1	1	3	6
Significant Characteristics					
14	-	2	1	3	5
23	-	-	1	1	1
32	-	1	-	1	2
Totals	-	3	2	5	8
Peripheral Characteristics					
19	1	-	-	1	3
Totals	1	-	-	1	3
Characteristics not related	N O N E				
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES					
Mood Characteristics	3	1	1	5	12
% of total	(60.0)	(20.0)	(20.0)	(33.3)	(40.0)
Music Characteristics	2	4	3	9	17
% of total	(40.0)	(80.0)	(60.0)	(60.0)	(56.7)
No. of no responses	-	-	1	1	1
% of total	(00.0)	(00.0)	(20.0)	(6.7)	(3.3)

TABLE 6G-18

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 3 Sixth Concert
Auditors in Music Training Category V

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	CHOICES First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS					
7	-	1	-	1	2
8	-	-	1	1	1
Totals	-	1	1	2	3
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS					
Pervading Characteristics					
18	1	-	-	1	3
20	1	-	-	1	3
27	2	2	3	7	13
31	1	-	-	1	3
Totals	5	2	3	10	22
Significant Characteristics					
9	1	1	1	3	6
14	-	1	1	2	3
26	-	1	-	1	2
32	-	-	1	1	1
33	-	1	-	1	2
34	-	-	1	1	1
Totals	1	4	4	9	15
Peripheral Characteristics					
19	-	2	-	2	4
25	1	-	-	1	3
Totals	1	2	-	3	7
Characteristics not related					
10	-	1	1	2	3
13	1	-	-	1	3
24	1	-	-	1	3
30	1	-	-	1	3
Totals	3	1	1	5	12

TABLE 6G-18 (continued)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES					
Mood Characteristics	-	1	1	2	3
% of total	(00.0)	(9.1)	(9.1)	(6.1)	(4.5)
Music Characteristics	10	9	8	27	56
% of total	(90.9)	(81.8)	(72.7)	(81.8)	(84.8)
No. of no responses	1	1	2	4	7
% of total	(9.1)	(9.1)	(18.2)	(12.1)	(10.7)

Tables 6G-19 through 6G-24 contain the summary of responses for Composition # 4 (Rochberg - Zodiac). (The overall summary is contained in 6G-19, and the listings in terms of formal music training are found in the remaining tables.) For all three choices the emphasis was again on music characteristics. Eight mood characteristics were selected at least twice, but only one was mentioned with enough frequency to be considered significant, namely, "dramatic, agitated, exciting, triumphant" (7), which had also been selected by those at the Fifth Concert as the one significant mood characteristic. There was a rather consistent scattering of responses, in terms of mood, among the remainder of the mood characteristics selected.

Of the 29 music characteristics selected at least once by the auditors, eight stood out as being significant. They were, in the order of frequency of selection:

9.* irregular melodic contour, disjointed (angular) (also selected most frequently by those at the Fifth Concert.)
32.* percussion color (same order as at Fifth Concert)
14.* dissonant sounds
27.* strange orchestral effects
19.* disjointed series of sounds (pointillistic)
25. cluttered texture, busy music
31.* dynamic contrast of music
16. masses or blocks of sound

"Irregular rhythms" (36), considered as important by the auditors at the Fifth Concer, did not receive the same emphasis by those at the Sixth Concert. Otherwise the order of frequency of selection was not significantly different.

TABLE 6G-19

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 4 Sixth Concert
Overall Summary

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	CHOICES First	 Second	 Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS					
1	3	1	-	4	11
2	7	3	2	12	29
3	1	1	2	4	7
4	-	2	-	2	4
5	2	-	3	5	9
6	5	2	-	7	19
7	27	5	2	34	93
8	6	6	2	14	32
Totals	51	20	11	82	204
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS					
Pervading Characteristics					
9	16	9	6	31	72
11	1	3	7	11	16
14	11	10	8	29	61
17	7	2	3	12	28
19	7	12	5	24	50
20	2	3	2	7	14
25	8	6	4	18	40
27	6	14	6	26	52
32	13	8	11	32	66
36	3	4	2	9	19
Totals	74	71	54	199	418
Significant Characteristics					
23	1	-	3	4	6
28	2	3	4	9	16
29	-	1	3	4	5
31	4	8	10	22	38
33	2	5	7	14	23
34	-	2	-	2	4
35	1	2	3	6	10
37	-	2	3	5	7
Totals	10	23	33	66	109

TABLE 6G-19 (continued)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS (continued)					
Peripheral Characteristics					
12	-	-	1	1	1
16	3	11	4	18	35
21	-	1	2	3	4
26	-	-	1	1	1
Totals	3	12	8	23	41
Characteristics not related					
10	1	2	-	3	7
13	1	2	3	6	10
15	1	2	-	3	7
18	5	2	-	7	19
22	1	-	-	1	3
24	-	2	1	3	5
30	2	-	-	2	6
Totals	11	10	4	25	57
SUMMARY OF RESPDNSES					
Mood Characteristics	51	20	11	82	204
% of total	(29.3)	(11.5)	(6.3)	(15.7)	(19.5)
Music Characteristics	98	116	99	313	625
% of total	(56.3)	(66.7)	(56.9)	(60.0)	(59.9)
No. of no responses	25	38	64	127	215
% of total	(14.4)	(21.8)	(36.8)	(24.3)	(20.6)

TABLE 6G-20

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 4 Sixth Concert
Auditors in Music Training Category I

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	CHOICES First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS					
1	3	-	-	3	9
2	2	1	-	3	8
3	1	1	-	2	5
4	-	2	-	2	4
5	-	-	1	1	1
6	1	1	-	2	5
7	7	-	1	8	22
8	1	1	2	4	7
Totals	15	6	4	25	61
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS					
Pervading Characteristics					
9	6	1	3	10	23
11	1	-	2	3	5
14	3	6	2	11	23
17	2	1	2	5	10
19	1	4	1	6	12
25	2	5	-	7	16
27	-	1	2	3	4
32	6	2	1	9	23
Totals	21	20	13	54	116
Significant Characteristics					
29	-	-	1	1	1
31	-	2	2	4	6
33	-	1	2	3	4
35	1	1	-	2	5
37	-	1	-	1	2
Totals	1	5	5	11	18
Peripheral Characteristics					
16	1	2	-	3	7
21	-	-	1	1	1
Totals	1	2	1	4	8

TABLE 6G-20 (continued)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS (continued)					
Characteristics not related					
10	-	2	-	2	4
13	-	1	1	2	3
18	1	-	-	1	3
Totals	1	3	1	5	10
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES					
Mood Characteristics	15	6	4	25	61
% of total	(29.4)	(11.8)	(7.8)	(16.3)	(19.9)
Music Characteristics	24	30	20	74	152
% of total	(47.1)	(58.8)	(39.2)	(48.4)	(49.7)
No. of no responses	12	15	27	54	93
% of total	(23.5)	(29.4)	(53.0)	(35.3)	(30.4)

TABLE 6G-21

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 4 Sixth Concert
Auditors in Music Training Category II

	CHOICES				
CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS					
1	-	1	-	1	2
2	4	2	1	7	17
5	2	-	-	2	6
6	2	-	-	2	6
7	15	4	-	19	53
8	4	5	-	9	22
Totals	27	12	1	40	106

TABLE 6G-21 (continued)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS					
Pervading Characteristics					
9	7	3	2	12	29
11	-	3	4	7	10
14	4	2	3	9	19
17	4	1	1	6	15
19	3	5	3	11	22
20	1	2	1	4	8
25	2	1	3	6	11
27	5	7	4	16	33
32	6	3	7	16	31
36	2	1	2	5	10
Totals	34	28	30	92	188
Significant Characteristics					
23	1	-	1	2	4
28	1	1	-	2	5
29	-	1	2	3	4
31	1	6	3	10	18
33	1	2	4	7	11
34	-	1	-	1	2
35	-	-	2	2	2
37	-	1	2	3	4
Totals	4	12	14	30	50
Peripheral Characteristics					
16	1	5	4	10	17
21	-	1	1	2	3
Totals	1	6	5	12	20
Characteristics not related					
10	1	-	-	1	3
13	-	-	2	2	2
15	1	1	-	2	5
18	3	2	-	5	13
22	1	-	-	1	3
24	-	2	1	3	5
30	1	-	-	1	3
Totals	7	5	3	15	34

TABLE 6G-21 (continued)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES					
Mood Characteristics	27	12	1	40	106
% of total	(32.9)	(14.6)	(1.2)	(16.3)	(21.5)
Music Characteristics	46	51	52	149	292
% of total	(56.1)	(62.2)	(63.4)	(60.6)	(59.3)
No. of no responses	9	19	29	57	94
% of total	(11.0)	(23.2)	(35.4)	(23.1)	(19.2)

TABLE 6G-22

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 4 Sixth Concert
Auditors in Music Training Category III

CHARACTERISTIC NO.		CHOICES			
	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS					
2	1	-	1	2	4
3	-	-	1	1	1
5	-	-	2	2	2
6	1	-	-	1	3
7	3	-	1	4	10
8	1	-	-	1	3
Totals	6	-	5	11	23
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS					
Pervading Characteristics					
9	1	4	1	6	12
11	-	-	1	1	1
14	1	1	-	2	5
17	1	-	-	1	3
19	2	1	1	4	9
20	-	1	1	2	3
25	3	-	1	4	10
27	1	3	-	4	9
32	1	3	2	6	11
36	-	3	-	3	6
Totals	10	16	7	33	69

TABLE 6G-22 (continued)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS (continued)					
Significant Characteristics					
23	-	-	1	1	1
28	1	2	1	4	8
31	2	-	3	5	9
33	1	1	-	2	5
35	-	1	1	2	3
37	-	-	1	1	1
Totals	4	4	7	15	27
Peripheral Characteristics					
16	-	2	-	2	4
26	-	-	1	1	1
Totals	-	2	1	3	5
Characteristics not related					
13	1	1	-	2	5
18	1	-	-	1	3
30	1	-	-	1	3
Totals	3	1	-	4	11
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES					
Mood Characteristics	6	-	5	11	23
% of total	(24.0)	(00.0)	(20.0)	(14.7)	(15.3)
Music Characteristics	17	23	15	55	112
% of total	(68.0)	(92.0)	(60.0)	(73.3)	(74.7)
No. of no responses	2	2	5	9	15
% of total	(8.0)	(8.0)	(20.0)	(12.0)	(10.0)

TABLE 6G-23

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 4 Sixth Concert
Auditors in Music Training Category IV

	CHOICES				
CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS					
3	-	-	1	1	1
6	1	-	-	1	3
7	1	1	-	2	5
Totals	2	1	1	4	9
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS					
Pervading Characteristics					
9	-	1	-	1	2
14	1	-	1	2	4
19	-	1	-	1	2
Totals	1	2	1	4	8
Significant Characteristics					
28	-	-	1	1	1
31	1	-	-	1	3
33	-	1	-	1	2
Totals	1	1	1	3	6
Peripheral Characteristics					
NONE					
Characteristics not related					
NONE					
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES					
Mood Characteristics	2	1	1	4	9
% of total	(40.0)	(20.0)	(20.0)	(26.7)	(30.0)
Music Characteristics	2	3	2	7	14
% of total	(40.0)	(60.0)	(40.0)	(46.7)	(46.7)
No. of no responses	1	1	2	4	7
% of total	(20.0)	(20.0)	(40.0)	(26.6)	(23.3)

TABLE 6G-24

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 4 Sixth Concert
Auditors in Music Training Category V

	CHOICES				
CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS					
6	-	1	-	1	2
7	1	-	-	1	3
Totals	1	1	-	2	5
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS					
Pervading Characteristics					
9	2	-	-	2	6
14	2	1	2	5	10
19	1	1	-	2	5
20	1	-	-	1	3
25	1	-	-	1	3
27	-	3	-	3	6
32	-	-	1	1	1
36	1	-	-	1	3
Totals	8	5	3	16	37
Significant Characteristics					
23	-	-	1	1	1
28	-	-	2	2	2
31	-	-	2	2	2
33	-	-	1	1	1
34	-	1	-	1	2
Totals	-	1	6	7	8
Peripheral Characteristics					
12	-	-	1	1	1
16	1	2	-	3	7
Totals	1	2	1	4	8
Characteristics not related					
15	-	1	-	1	2
Totals	-	1	-	1	2

TABLE 6G-24 (continued)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES					
Mood Characteristics	1	1	-	2	5
% of total	(9.1)	(9.1)	(00.0)	(6.1)	(7.6)
Music Characteristics	9	9	10	28	55
% of total	(81.8)	(81.8)	(90.0)	(84.8)	(83.3)
No. of no responses	1	1	1	3	6
% of total	(9.1)	(9.1)	(9.1)	(9.1)	(9.1)

Tables 6G-25 through 6G-30 contain the summary of responses for Composition # 5 (Kraft - Three Pieces). (The overall summary is contained in 6G-25, and the listings in terms of formal music training are found in the remaining tables.) As this work consisted of three distinctly different pieces, the responses to the stylistic characteristics were quite diverse. The emphasis was on the selection of music characteristics for all three choices, hence the frequency of selection of mood characteristics were selected at least four times, and only one was selected with enough frequency to be considered significant, namely, "dramatic, agitated, exciting, triumphant" (7). (Again this agreed with the responses of the auditors at the Fifth Concert.) The other mood characteristics were grouped rather closely together in terms of frequency of selection.

In this work none of the music characteristics were judged by the styles analysts to be "pervading characteristics." 20 music characteristics were determined by the styles analysts to be "significant characteristics." And, in the responses of the auditors at the Sixth Concert, there was a general scattering of responses among the "significant and peripheral characteristics." (The same was true among the responses of the auditors at the Fifth Concert.) Only three music characteristics were mentioned frequently enough to be considered significant. They were, in their order of frequency:

9.* irregular melodic contour, disjointed (angular) (also selected most frequently by the auditors at the Fifth Concert)
14.* dissonant sounds
32.* percussion color

There was more diversity between the two groups of auditors with respect to the music characteristics of Composition # 5.

TABLE 6G-25

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 5 Sixth Concert
Overall Summary

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	CHOICES First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS					
1	3	-	1	4	10
2	5	-	3	8	18
3	3	2	1	6	14
4	6	1	1	8	21
5	3	1	-	4	11
6	2	4	-	6	14
7	16	7	5	28	67
8	10	3	2	15	38
Totals	48	18	13	79	193
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS					
Pervading Characteristics N O N E					
Significant Characteristics					
9	11	12	3	26	60
10	8	6	1	15	37
14	9	9	13	31	58
17	3	4	2	9	19
18	3	3	4	10	19
19	2	4	7	13	21
20	1	3	-	4	9
21	3	3	3	9	18
23	2	3	2	7	14
25	7	3	5	15	32
26	-	1	1	2	3
27	2	8	3	13	25
28	3	5	2	10	21
29	4	7	5	16	31
31	7	4	4	15	33
32	8	10	4	22	48
33	5	2	5	12	24
34	1	3	3	7	12

TABLE 6G-25 (continued)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS (continued)					
Significant Characteristics (continued)					
36	3	2	4	9	17
37	4	1	3	8	17
Totals	86	93	74	253	518
Peripheral Characteristics					
13	3	2	2	7	15
15	-	1	-	1	2
16	3	4	3	10	20
35	-	1	-	1	2
Totals	6	8	5	19	39
Characteristics not related					
11	-	4	3	7	11
24	1	1	2	4	7
30	1	-	1	2	4
Totals	2	5	6	13	22
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES					
Mood Characteristics	48	18	13	79	193
% of total	(27.6)	(10.3)	(7.5)	(15.1)	(18.5)
Music Characteristics	94	106	85	285	579
% of total	(54.0)	(60.9)	(48.9)	(54.6)	(55.5)
No. of no responses	32	50	76	158	272
% of total	(18.4)	(28.7)	(43.6)	(30.3)	(26.0)

TABLE 6G-26

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 5 Sixth Concert
Auditors in Music Training Category I

RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	CHOICES First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
2	1	-	-	1	3
3	-	-	1	1	1
4	3	-	-	2	9
5	1	1	-	2	5
6	1	1	-	2	5
7	4	2	1	7	17
8	4	1	-	5	14
Totals	14	5	2	21	54

RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS

Pervading Characteristics NONE

Significant Characteristics

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
9	5	-	-	5	15
10	1	2	-	3	7
14	3	5	3	11	22
17	1	2	1	4	8
18	-	1	1	2	3
19	-	2	2	4	6
21	-	1	1	2	3
23	1	1	-	2	5
25	1	-	1	2	4
27	1	1	1	3	6
28	1	2	-	3	7
29	1	2	4	7	11
31	1	-	-	1	3
32	1	4	1	6	12
33	2	2	1	5	11
34	-	1	-	1	2
36	-	-	1	1	1
37	4	-	1	5	13
Totals	23	26	18	67	139

Peripheral Characteristics

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
13	1	-	-	1	3
16	-	1	-	1	2
Totals	1	1	-	2	5

TABLE 6G-26 (continued)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS (continued)					
Characteristics not related					
24	1	1	1	3	6
Totals	1	1	1	3	6
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES					
Mood Characteristics	14	5	2	21	54
% of total	(27.5)	(9.8)	(3.9)	(13.7)	(17.6)
Music Characteristics	25	28	19	72	150
% of total	(49.0)	(54.9)	(37.3)	(47.1)	(49.1)
No. of no responses	12	18	30	60	102
% of total	(23.5)	(35.3)	(58.8)	(39.2)	(33.3)

TABLE 6G-27

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 5 Sixth Concert
Auditors in Music Training Category II

		CHOICES			
CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS					
1	2	-	1	3	7
2	2	-	3	5	9
3	1	2	-	3	7
4	2	1	-	3	8
5	2	-	-	2	6
6	1	1	-	2	5
7	9	4	2	15	37
8	4	1	2	7	16
Totals	23	9	8	40	95

TABLE 6G-27 (continued)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS					
Pervading Characteristics		NONE			
Significant Characteristics					
9	2	9	2	13	26
10	3	2	1	6	14
14	5	3	5	13	26
17	2	1	-	3	8
18	3	2	1	6	14
19	1	1	3	5	8
20	1	3	-	4	9
21	2	1	1	4	9
23	1	1	1	3	6
25	4	1	1	6	15
26	-	1	-	1	2
27	1	3	2	6	11
28	-	2	-	2	4
29	1	3	1	5	10
31	5	3	3	11	24
32	3	4	3	10	20
33	2	-	1	3	7
34	-	1	2	3	4
36	2	2	1	5	11
37	-	1	2	3	4
Totals	38	44	30	112	232
Peripheral Characteristics					
13	1	1	1	3	6
16	2	1	3	6	11
35	-	1	-	1	2
Totals	3	3	4	10	19
Characteristics not related					
11	-	2	2	4	6
24	-	-	1	1	1
30	1	-	1	2	4
Totals	1	2	4	7	11

TABLE 6G-27 (continued)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES					
Mood Characteristics	23	9	8	40	95
% of total	(28.0)	(11.0)	(9.8)	(16.3)	(19.3)
Music Characteristics	42	49	38	129	262
% of total	(51.3)	(59.8)	(46.3)	(52.4)	(53.3)
No. of no responses	17	24	36	77	135
% of total	(20.7)	(29.2)	(43.9)	(31.3)	(27.4)

TABLE 6G-28

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 5   Sixth Concert
Auditors in Music Training Category III

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	CHOICES First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS					
2	2	-	-	2	6
3	2	-	-	2	6
4	-	-	1	1	1
6	-	1	-	1	2
7	2	-	2	4	8
8	1	1	-	2	5
Totals	7	2	3	12	28

RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS

Pervading Characteristics

NONE

TABLE 6G-28 (continued)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS (continued)					
Significant Characteristics					
9	2	3	1	6	13
10	1	1	-	2	5
14	1	-	3	4	6
17	-	1	1	2	3
18	-	-	2	2	2
19	1	1	2	4	7
21	1	-	1	2	4
23	-	1	1	2	3
25	1	2	1	4	8
27	-	3	-	3	6
28	2	-	1	3	7
29	1	1	-	2	5
31	-	1	-	1	2
32	4	-	-	4	12
33	-	-	2	2	2
34	-	1	-	1	2
36	1	-	-	1	3
Totals	15	15	15	45	90
Peripheral Characteristics					
13	1	-	1	2	4
16	1	2	-	3	7
Totals	2	2	1	5	11
Characteristics not related					
11	-	2	1	3	5
Totals	-	2	1	3	5
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES					
Mood Characteristics	7	2	3	12	28
% of total	(28.0)	(8.0)	(12.0)	(16.0)	(18.7)
Music Characteristics	17	19	17	53	106
% of total	(68.0)	(76.0)	(68.0)	(70.7)	(70.7)
No. of no responses	1	4	5	10	16
% of total	(4.0)	(16.0)	(20.0)	(13.3)	(10.6)

TABLE 6G-29

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 5 Sixth Concert
Auditors in Music Training Category IV

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	CHOICES First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS					
1	1	-	-	1	3
7	-	1	-	1	2
8	1	-	-	1	3
Totals	2	1	-	3	8
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS					
Pervading Characteristics NONE					
Significant Characteristics					
8	1	-	-	1	3
10	-	1	-	1	2
26	-	-	1	1	1
28	-	1	-	1	2
29	1	-	-	1	3
36	-	-	1	1	1
Totals	2	2	2	6	12
Peripheral Characteristics NONE					
Characteristics not related NONE					
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES					
Mood Characteristics	2	1	-	3	8
% of total	(40.0)	(20.0)	(00.0)	(20.0)	(26.7)
Music Characteristics	2	2	2	6	12
% of total	(40.0)	(40.0)	(40.0)	(40.0)	(40.0)
No. of no responses	1	2	3	6	10
% of total	(20.0)	(40.0)	(60.0)	(40.0)	(33.3)

TABLE 6G-30

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 5 Sixth Concert
Auditors in Music Training Category V

		CHOICES			
CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS					
4	1	-	-	1	3
6	-	1	-	1	2
7	1	-	-	1	3
Totals	2	1	-	3	8
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS					
Pervading Characteristics NONE					
Significant Characteristics					
9	1	-	-	1	3
10	3	-	-	3	9
14	-	1	2	3	4
21	-	1	-	1	2
25	1	-	2	3	5
27	-	1	-	1	2
28	-	-	1	1	1
29	-	1	-	1	2
31	1	-	1	2	4
32	-	2	-	2	4
33	1	-	1	2	4
34	1	-	1	2	4
36	-	-	1	1	1
Totals	8	6	9	23	45
Peripheral Characteristics					
13	-	1	-	1	2
15	-	1	-	1	2
Totals	-	2	-	2	4

Characteristics not related

NONE

TABLE 6G-30 (continued)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES					
Mood Characteristics	2	1	-	3	8
% of total	(18.2)	(9.1)	(00.0)	(9.1)	(12.1)
Music Characteristics	8	8	9	25	49
% of total	(72.7)	(72.7)	(81.8)	(75.6)	(74.2)
No. of no responses	1	2	2	5	9
% of total	(9.1)	(18.2)	(18.2)	(15.3)	(13.7)

Tables 6G-31 through 6G-36 contain the summary of responses for Composition # 6 (Starer - Samson Agonistes). (The overall summary is contained in Table 6G-31, and the listings in terms of formal music training are found in the remaining tables.) The traditional sound of this composition was evident in the emphasis on mood characteristics as a first choice. Again, however, the emphasis shifted to music characteristics for the second and third choices. One mood characteristic again stood out as easily the most significant mood of the composition, in terms of the responses by the auditors, namely, "dramatic, agitated, exciting, triumphant" (7). One other mood characteristic was mentioned with enough frequency to be considered significant, namely, "majestic, martial, vigorous" (8). (The mood characteristic "bright, cheerful, gay" '6', was not mentioned as frequently by the auditors at the Sixth Concert as it had been by those at the Fifth Concert.)

Responses to music characteristics were fairly well scattered among 28 music characteristics, with only three being selected with enough frequency to be considered significant. They were, in the order of frequency:

32.* percussion color (also selected more frequently by those at the Fifth Concert)
31.* dynamic contrast of music
34. repetitive rhythms

Due to the scattering of responses among the music characteristics there was some difference in the importance placed on the various music characteristics when comparing the responses of the auditors at the two concerts. However, there was a general agreement as far as the more important ones were concerned.

TABLE 6G-31

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 6 Sixth Concert
Overall Summary

	CHOICES				
CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS					
1	3	1	2	6	13
2	3	4	-	7	17
3	1	1	1	3	6
4	1	1	3	5	8
5	1	2	-	3	7
6	6	4	-	10	26
7	54	17	4	75	200
8	22	16	5	43	103
Totals	91	46	15	152	380
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS					
Pervading Characteristics					
18	4	3	9	16	27
26	-	1	-	1	2
34	6	5	6	17	34
Totals	10	9	15	34	63
Significant Characteristics					
9	5	4	6	15	29
10	4	6	4	14	28
14	5	4	5	14	28
15	-	-	1	1	1
16	2	1	3	6	11
21	2	5	4	11	20
22	1	-	-	1	3
23	3	1	-	4	11
27	2	1	3	6	11
28	1	4	1	6	12
29	4	1	5	10	19
31	4	8	6	18	34
32	3	8	11	22	36
33	4	8	3	15	31
36	-	3	2	5	8
Totals	40	54	54	148	282

TABLE 6G-31 (continued)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS (continued)					
Peripheral Characteristics					
13	-	1	3	4	5
19	2	2	1	5	11
20	1	1	4	6	9
24	-	1	2	3	4
37	2	6	5	13	23
Totals	5	11	15	31	52
Characteristics not related					
11	1	3	-	4	9
17	2	1	1	4	9
25	-	3	2	5	8
30	-	2	-	2	4
35	-	-	1	1	1
Totals	3	9	4	16	31
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES					
Mood Characteristics	91	46	15	152	380
% of total	(52.3)	(26.4)	(8.6)	(29.1)	(36.4)
Music Characteristics	58	83	88	229	428
% of total	(33.3)	(47.7)	(50.6)	(43.9)	(41.0)
No. of no responses	25	45	71	141	236
% of total	(14.4)	(25.9)	(40.8)	(27.0)	(22.6)

TABLE 6G-32

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 6 Sixth Concert
Auditors in Music Training Category I

	CHOICES				
CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS					
1	1	1	-	2	5
2	-	1	-	1	2
4	1	-	1	2	4
5	-	1	-	1	2
6	1	3	-	4	9
7	18	8	-	26	70
8	9	3	-	12	33
Totals	30	17	1	48	125
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS					
Pervading Characteristics					
18	-	-	4	4	4
34	1	2	3	6	10
Totals	1	2	7	10	14
Significant Characteristics					
9	2	1	2	5	10
10	-	1	3	4	5
14	-	-	1	1	1
21	1	2	-	3	7
23	2	-	-	2	6
27	1	1	1	3	6
29	2	-	1	3	7
31	1	3	-	4	9
32	-	2	5	7	9
33	-	-	1	1	1
Totals	9	10	14	33	61
Peripheral Characteristics					
19	1	-	-	1	3
24	-	1	-	1	2
37	1	1	3	5	8
Totals	2	2	3	7	13

TABLE 6G-32 (continued)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS (continued)					
Characteristics not related					
17	-	1	-	1	2
25	-	1	-	1	2
30	-	2	-	2	4
Totals	-	4	-	4	8
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES					
Mood Characteristics	30	17	1	48	125
% of total	(58.8)	(33.3)	(2.0)	(31.4)	(40.9)
Music Characteristics	12	18	24	54	96
% of total	(23.5)	(35.3)	(47.1)	(35.3)	(31.4)
No. of no responses	9	16	26	51	85
% of total	(17.7)	(31.4)	(50.9)	(33.3)	(27.7)

TABLE 6G-33

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 6 Sixth Concert
Auditors in Music Training Category II

		CHOICES			
CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS					
1	1	-	1	2	4
2	2	2	-	4	10
3	-	1	-	1	2
4	-	-	2	2	2
5	1	1	-	2	5
6	4	-	-	4	12
7	26	5	4	35	92
8	8	10	4	22	48
Totals	42	19	11	72	175

TABLE 6G-33 (continued)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS					
Pervading Characteristics					
18	3	2	3	8	16
34	5	3	2	10	23
Totals	8	5	5	18	39
Significant Characteristics					
9	1	2	3	6	10
10	2	3	-	5	12
14	4	1	2	7	16
15	-	-	1	1	1
16	-	1	3	4	5
21	1	3	3	7	12
23	1	1	-	2	5
27	1	-	2	3	5
28	-	1	1	2	3
29	-	-	1	1	1
31	2	1	4	7	12
32	1	4	5	10	16
33	3	8	-	11	25
36	-	2	1	3	5
Totals	16	27	26	69	128
Peripheral Characteristics					
13	-	1	2	3	4
19	-	2	1	3	5
20	1	1	1	3	6
24	-	-	2	2	2
37	1	5	2	8	15
Totals	2	9	8	19	32
Characteristics not related					
11	1	2	-	3	7
17	2	-	-	2	6
25	-	1	1	2	3
35	-	-	1	1	1
Totals	3	3	2	8	17

TABLE 6G-33 (continued)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES					
Mood Characteristics	42	19	11	72	175
% of total	(51.2)	(23.2)	(13.4)	(29.3)	(35.6)
Music Characteristics	29	44	41	114	216
% of total	(35.4)	(53.7)	(50.0)	(46.3)	(43.9)
No. of no responses	11	19	30	60	101
% of total	(13.4)	(23.1)	(36.6)	(24.4)	(20.5)

TABLE 6G-34

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 6 Sixth Concert
Auditors in Music Training Category III

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	CHOICES First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS					
1	1	-	-	1	3
2	1	1	-	2	5
3	1	-	-	1	3
4	-	1	-	1	2
6	1	1	-	2	5
7	8	3	-	11	30
8	2	1	1	4	9
Totals	14	7	1	22	57
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS					
Pervading Characteristics					
18	-	1	1	2	3
34	-	-	1	1	1
Totals	-	1	2	3	4

TABLE 6G-34 (continued)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS (continued)					
Significant Characteristics					
9	2	1	1	4	9
10	1	1	-	2	5
14	1	1	2	4	7
21	-	-	1	1	1
28	1	2	-	3	7
29	-	-	3	3	3
31	1	3	1	5	10
32	1	1	1	3	6
33	-	-	1	1	1
36	-	1	1	2	3
Totals	7	10	11	28	52
Peripheral Characteristics					
19	1	-	-	1	3
20	-	-	1	1	1
Totals	1	-	1	2	4
Characteristics not related					
11	-	1	-	1	2
17	-	-	1	1	1
25	-	1	-	1	2
Totals	-	2	1	3	5
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES					
Mood Characteristics	14	7	1	22	57
% of total	(56.0)	(28.0)	(4.0)	(29.3)	(38.0)
Music Characteristics	8	13	15	36	65
% of total	(32.0)	(52.0)	(60.0)	(48.0)	(43.3)
No. of no responses	3	5	9	17	28
% of total	(12.0)	(20.0)	(36.0)	(22.7)	(18.7)

TABLE 6G-35

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 6 Sixth Concert
Auditors in Music Training Category IV

	CHOICES				
CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS					
1	-	-	1	1	1
3	-	-	1	1	1
7	2	-	-	2	6
8	1	1	-	2	5
Totals	3	1	2	6	13
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS					
Pervading Characteristics					
NONE					
Significant Characteristics					
29	1	1	-	2	5
32	1	1	-	2	5
Totals	2	2	-	4	10
Peripheral Characteristics					
13	-	-	1	1	1
Totals	-	-	1	1	1
Characteristics not related					
NONE					
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES					
Mood Characteristics	3	1	2	6	13
% of total	(60.0)	(20.0)	(40.0)	(40.0)	(43.3)
Music Characteristics	2	2	1	5	11
% of total	(40.0)	(40.0)	(20.0)	(33.3)	(36.7)
No. of no responses	-	2	2	4	6
% of total	(00.0)	(40.0)	(40.0)	(26.7)	(20.0)

TABLE 6G-36

Summary of Responses to Stylistic Characteristics
Composition # 6 Sixth Concert
Auditors in Music Training Category V

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	CHOICES First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
RESPONSES TO MOOD CHARACTERISTICS					
7	-	1	-	1	2
8	2	1	-	3	8
Totals	2	2	-	4	10
RESPONSES TO MUSIC CHARACTERISTICS					
Pervading Characteristics					
18	1	-	1	2	4
26	-	1	-	1	2
Totals	1	1	1	3	6
Significant Characteristics					
10	1	1	1	3	6
14	-	2	-	2	4
16	2	-	-	2	6
22	1	-	-	1	3
28	-	1	-	1	2
29	1	-	-	1	3
31	-	1	1	2	3
33	1	-	1	2	4
Totals	6	5	3	14	31
Peripheral Characteristics					
20	-	-	2	2	2
Totals	-	-	2	2	2
Characteristics not related					
25	-	-	1	1	1
Totals	-	-	1	1	1

TABLE 6G-36 (continued)

CHARACTERISTIC NO.	First	Second	Third	Total	Sum
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES					
Mood Characteristics	2	2	-	4	10
% of total	(18.2)	(18.2)	(00.0)	(12.1)	(15.2)
Music Characteristics	7	6	7	20	40
% of total	(63.6)	(54.5)	(63.6)	(60.6)	(60.6)
No. of no responses	2	3	4	9	16
% of total	(18.2)	(27.3)	(36.4)	(27.3)	(24.2)

The general agreement between the auditors at the Fifth and Sixth Concerts as to which were the more important mood and music characteristics was quite obvious. While there were some differences the same general patterns could be observed. This was especially significant since the two samples were somewhat different in makeup, and it would not have been unrealistic to assume that their responses to mood and music characteristics would be more diverse. The consistency between emphasis on mood and music characteristics was even more noteworthy. This will be discussed at greater length in the next chapter.

PART II

In analyzing the data collected at the special concert presented by the College-Conservatory of Music Woodwind Quintet, it was necessary to examine statistically the aesthetic attitudes of the school children in terms of the four groupings of the experimental design and the three age-educational levels.

The participating pupils had been divided into three categories according to their year in school. The three categories were:

I. Elementary level, pupils in the upper elementary grades four through six.

II. Junior high level, pupils in grades seven through nine.
III. Senior high level, students in grades ten through twelve.

The school pupils had also been divided into four basic groups, as follows:

A. Control Group, those who received no special instruction prior to attending the concert.

B. Experimental Group # 1, thowe who received special instruction relating to the structural and stylistic characteristics of the music, and who heard a tape recording of the music prior to the concert.

C. Experimental Group # 2, those who received special instruction which included historical backgrounds of the woodwind quintet and biographical information relating to each composer represented on the concert, as well as hearing a tape recording of the music prior to the concert.

D. Experimental Group # 3, those who received no special instruction, but who did hear a tape recording of the music prior to the concert.

Therefore, each category was represented in each of the four groupings of the experimental design.

Music Performed in the Study

Four different woodwind quintets were performed by the College-Conservatory of Music Woodwind Quintet as a part of the study. Eight movemehts of the four compositions were used, with the pupils in the study indicating an aesthetic attitude (preference response) for each of the eight movements. The works used and the order of performance was as follows:

1. Pastoral — Vincent Persichetti

Quintet — David Diamond
2. Movement II - Theme and Variations

Quintet No. 2 Alvin Etler

3. Movement I - Andante con moto
4. Movement II - Allegro commodo
5. Movement III - Adagio
6. Movement IV - Vivace

Quintet No. 2 William Sydeman

7. Movement I - Allegro
8. Movement II - Allegro

The stylistic analyses of the music performed for Part II of the study may be found in Appendix J.

Statistical Analysis

The *t* test was used to study the differences in aesthetic attitudes, specifically, preference responses between each of the four groups in each of the three categories of pupils. Essentially, the *t* test statistically compared the mean preference response of the pupils in one group with the mean preference response of the pupils in each of the other three groups in each category. The same process was then repeated, comparing the mean preference response of the pupils in one category with the mean preference responses of the pupils in each of the other two categories within each group.

The Elementary Category

There were a total of 464 pupils in the elementary category who took part in the study. They were divided into the four groups of the experimental design as follows:

Control Group - 101 pupils,
Experimental Group # 1 - 106 pupils,
Experimental Group # 2 - 134 pupils,
Experimental Group # 3 - 123 pupils.

Table 7A-1 lists the preference responses to Composition # 1 (Persichetti - Pastoral) for the Elementary Category.

TABLE 7A-1

Summary of Preference Responses
Composition # 1 Elementary Category

GROUP	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean	Standard Deviation
Contral	81	16	0	3	1	1.713	.715
Exp. Gp. #1	88	15	1	0	0	1.764	.655
Exp. Gp. #2	101	29	4	0	0	1.724	.523
Exp. Gp. #3	94	23	4	1	1	1.634	.789

The comparison of the t scores between the various groups was as follows:

Between the Control Group and Experimental Group
# # 1 - 0.541 - not significant;
between the Control Group and Experimental Group # 2 - 0.136 - not significant;
between the Control Group and Experimental Group # 3 - 0.229 - not significant;
between Experimental Groups #1 and #2 - 0.5412 - not significant;
between Experimental Groups #1 and #3 - 0.840 - significant at the .750 level;
between Experimental Groups #2 and #3 - 0.435 - not significant.

The only significant difference which occurred was between Experimental Groups #1 and #3. The level of significance was low and was of limited value. In general it was determined that there was no real significant difference in the responses between the four groups for Composition # 1.

Therefore, there was no significant difference in the manner in which the pupils in the elementary category responded to Composition # 1.

Table 7A-2 lists the preference responses to Composition # 2 (Diamond - Theme and Variations) for the Elementary Category.

TABLE 7A-2

Summary of Preference Responses
Composition # 2 Elementary Category

GROUP	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean	Standard Deviation
Control	19	25	17	22	18	0.0495	1.390
Exp. Gp. #1	34	26	15	28	3	0.5660	1.260
Exp. Gp. #2	25	56	21	15	17	0.4254	1.266
Exp. Gp. #3	31	36	30	17	9	0.5122	1.213

The t scores between the various groups were as follows:

Between the Control Group and Experimental Group #1 - 2.789 - significant at the .995 level;
between the Control Group and Experimental Group #2 - 2.149 - significant at the .975 level;
between the Control Group and Experimental Group #3 - 2.646 - significant at the .995 level;
between Experimental Groups #1 and #2 - 0.853 - significant at the .750 level;
between Experimental Groups #1 and #3 - 0.328 - not significant;
between Experimental Groups #2 and #3 - 0.558 - not significant.

There were significant differences between the preference responses of the Control Group and the three experimental groups. In each case the experimental groups responded more favorably to the composition than did the Control Group. The significant difference between Experimental Groups #1 and #2 was at the lowest level of significance and was not considered to be particularly significant. It was determined that there was no significant difference in the responses between the three experimental groups.

The Diamond Quintet was a serial technique work. The Theme and Variations (Composition # 2) utilized a tone row, and was quite dissonant. The tempo was slow and the melodic lines were quite difficult to discern.

It was determined that the special instructions and previous hearings of the music, which the three experimental groups received, did affect significantly the manner in which they responded to the music.

Table 7A-3 lists the preference responses to Composition # 3 (Etler - Mvt. I) for the Elementary Category.

TABLE 7A-3

Summary of Preference Responses
Composition # 3 Elementary Category

GROUP	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean	Standard Deviation
Control	34	39	15	8	5	0.8812	1.112
Exp. Gp. #1	41	29	17	6	13	0.7453	1.344
Exp. Gp. #2	46	34	30	20	4	0.7313	1.167
Exp. Gp. #3	46	35	19	16	7	0.7886	1.232

The t scores, comparing the responses between the four groups, were as follows:

Between the Control Group and Experimental Group #1 - 0.786 - significant at the .750 level;
between the Control Group and Experimental Group #2 - 0.990 - significant at the .750 level;
between the Control Group and Experimental Group #3 - 0.582 - not significant;
between Experimental Groups #1 and #2 - 0.085 - not significant;
between Experimental Groups #1 and #3 - 0.253 - not significant;
between Experimental Groups #2 and #3 - 0.381 - not significant.

The significant differences in responses between the Control Group and Experimental Groups #1 and #2 were at the lowest level and were not considered to be of real significance. Hence it was determined that special training had no real effect upon the manner in which the pupils of the experimental groups responded to the composition.

This movement of the Etler *Quintet* was slow and utilized traditional tonalities. Melodically it was diatonic and generally conjunct. The sonorities were only mildly dissonant. There was an emphasis on rhythmic activity.

Table 7A-4 lists the preference responses to Composition # 4 (Etler - Mvt. II) for the Elementary Category.

TABLE 7A-4

Summary of Preference Responses
Composition # 4 Elementary Category

GROUP	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean	Standard Deviation
Control	59	29	10	3	0	1.4257	.788
Exp. Gp. #1	49	33	12	7	5	1.0755	1.344
Exp. Gp. #2	74	36	13	7	4	1.2612	1.028
Exp. Gp. #3	72	32	9	8	2	1.3333	.977

The _t_ scores, comparing the responses between the four groups, were as follows:

Between the Control Group and Experimental Group #1 - 2.569 - significant at the .990 level;
between the Control Group and Experimental Group #2 - 1.326 - significant at the .900 level;
between the Control Group and Experimental Group #3 - 0.760 - significant at the .750 level;
between Experimental Groups #1 and #2 - 1.328 - significant at the .900 level;
between Experimental Groups #1 and #3 - 1.849 - significant at the .950 level;
between Experimental Groups #2 and #3 - 0.572 - not significant.

The Control Group did tend to respond significantly different to the second movement of the Etler _Quintet_. They tended to react more favorably than did the Experimental groups. Indeed, the special instructions in style, as well as in historical and biographical background information, appeared to have a more adverse effect upon the pupils than did just listening to the music (Experimental Group #3 reacted somewhat more favorably than did the other two experimental groups.)

This movement of the Etler _Quintet_ differed from the first movement primarily in terms of tempo. The allegro tempo provided a faster pace to the music. Otherwise, from a stylistic standpoint, it was quite similar. It should also be noted that all four groups responded more favorably to this movement than they did to the first movement. (See Table 7A-3 for comparison.)

Table 7A-5 lists the preference responses to Composition # 5 (Etler - Mvt. III) for the Elementary Category.

TABLE 7A-5

Summary of Preference Responses
Composition # 5 Elementary Category

GROUP	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean	Standard Deviation
Control	29	28	18	19	7	0.5247	1.272
Exp. Gp. #1	29	20	27	18	12	0.3396	1.337
Exp. Gp. #2	34	35	32	20	13	0.4254	1.141
Exp. Gp. #3	36	30	27	21	9	0.5122	1.272

The t scores, comparing the responses between the four groups, were as follows:

Between the Control Group and Experimental Group #1 - 1.012 - significant at the .750 level;
between the Control Group and Experimental Group #2 - 0.588 - not significant;
between the Control Group and Experimental Group #3 - 0.074 - not significant;
between Experimental Groups #1 and #2 - 0.503 - not significant;
between Experimental Groups #1 and #3 - 0.994 - significant at the .750 level;
between Experimental Groups #2 and #3 - 0.543 - not significant.

The only levels of significant difference observed were low and of doubtful significance. Hence it was determined that special training and previous hearings had no effect on the manner in which pupils responded to the composition.

The third movement of the Etler Quintet was very slow (adagio) and lacked the rhythmic activity which was so characteristic of the other three movements of the Quintet. Otherwise it was very similar, stylistically, to the first two movements. It should be noted that all four groups responded less favorably to this movement than they had to the first two movements.

Table 7A-6 lists the preference responses to Composition # 6 (Etler - Mvt. IV) for the Elementary Category.

TABLE 7A-6

Summary of Preference Responses
Composition # 6 Elementary Category

GROUP	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean	Standard Deviation
Control	58	23	10	7	3	1.2475	1.076
Exp. Gp. #1	62	22	7	9	6	1.1792	1.076
Exp. Gp. #2	80	32	10	9	3	1.3209	1.018
Exp. Gp. #3	68	27	17	8	3	1.2114	1.063

The _t_ scores, comparing the responses between the four groups, were as follows:

Between the Control Group and Experimental Group #1 - 0.424 - not significant;
between the Control Group and Experimental Group #2 - 0.527 - not significant;
between the Control Group and Experimental Group #3 = 0.250 - not significant;
between the Experimental Groups #1 and #2 - 0.973 - significant at the .750 level;
between Experimental Groups #1 and #3 - 0.212 - not significant;
between Experimental Groups #2 and #3 - 0.835 - significant at the .750 level.

The only levels of significance observed were low and of doubtful value. It was again determined that special training and previous hearings had no effect on the manner in which the pupils responded to the composition.

The fourth movement of the Etler _Quintet_ was very fast (vivace) and highly rhythmic. Emphasis was on the coloristic variety available within a woodwind quintet. The movement was tonal with diatonic melodies (generally conjunct). The texture was thin and the movement of the music was fairly easy to follow. The response of all four groups was more favorable towards this movement than to the first or third movements. It was similar to the responses of the four groups to the second movement, the other fast movement of the _Quintet_.

Table 7A-7 lists the preference responses to Composition # 7 (Sydeman - Mvt. I) for the Elementary Category.

TABLE 7A-7

Summary of Preference Responses
Composition # 7 Elementary Category

GROUP	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean	Standard Deviation
Control	33	36	9	13	10	0.6832	1.313
Exp. Gp. #1	47	27	13	13	6	0.9057	1.248
Exp. Gp. #2	38	38	23	17	17	0.4527	1.358
Exp. Gp. #3	48	24	24	12	15	0.6341	1.392

The t scores, comparing the responses between the four groups, were as follows:

Between the Control Group and Experimental Group #1 - 1.243 - significant at the .750 level;
between the Control Group and Experimental Group #2 - 1.243 - significant at the .750 level;
between the Control Group and Experimental Group #3 - 0.268 - not significant;
between Experimental Groups #1 and #2 - 2.587 - significant at the .990 level;
between Experimental Groups #1 and #3 - 1.533 - significant at the .900 level;
between Experimental Groups #2 and #3 - 0.995 - significant at the .750 level.

Here the significant difference, although still somewhat limited began to show more significant characteristics of the responses as a result of previous training. While the levels of significance were not high, the consistent differences which appeared tend to support the idea that previous training did affect responses to this composition. Experimental Group #1, which received the stylistic analysis, responded more favorably than did the other three groups, suggesting that an understanding of the musical style did encourage a more favorable response. Experimental Group #2, which received the historical and biographical information, responded least favorably, suggesting that this particular information did nothing to increase the understanding of the music or to encourage a more favorable response. Those in Experimental Group #3, which had heard the music only once prior to attending the concert, did not respond any differently than did the Control group.

Stylistically the Sydeman _Quintet_ was the most difficult work of the four quintets to listen to. An example of post-Webern pointillism, it was atonal, pointillistic, highly dissonant, with angular melody that was disjunct and discontinuous (unpredictable), and with extremely wide pitch ranges. This movement had a slow introduction, a fast middle section, and a slow ending.

Table 7A-8 lists the preference responses to Composition # 8 (Sydeman - Mvt. II) for the Elementary Category.

TABLE 7A-8

Summary of Preference Responses
Composition # 8 Elementary Category

GROUP	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean	Standard Deviation
Control	62	25	7	5	2	1.3861	.954
Exp. Gp. #1	80	16	5	4	1	1.6038	.821
Exp. Gp. #2	91	24	5	6	8	1.3731	1.137
Exp. Gp. #3	85	27	5	4	2	1.5366	.849

The _t_ scores, comparing the responses between the four groups, were as follows:

> Between the Control Group and Experimental Group #1 - 1.744 - significant at the .950 level;
> between the Control Group and Experimental Group #2 - 0.092 - not significant;
> between the Control Group and Experimental Group #3 - 1.237 - significant at the .750 level;
> between Experimental Groups #1 and #2 - 1.743 - significant at the .950 level;
> between Experimental Groups #1 and #3 - 0.601 - not significant;
> between Experimental Groups #2 and #3 - 1.286 - significant at the .750 level.

The significant differences for Composition # 8 were similar in significance to those for Composition # 7. The levels were higher in some cases. Again the special instructions in the stylistic analysis of the work provided Experimental Group #1 did affect the manner in which they responded to the work. Their mean response was higher than the mean responses of the other three groups.

Experimental Group #2, which received historical and biographical backgrounds, responded least favorably, again suggesting that this particular information did nothing to increase the understanding of the music or to encourage a more favorable response. Experimental Group #3, which had heard the music once, tended to respond more favorably than did the Control Group, and their mean response was not significantly different from that of Experimental Group #1.

The second movement of the Sydeman Quintet was actually a scherzo, with much rhythmic activity, and, in a sense, more disjointed due to the faster tempo. The basic stylistic considerations mentioned for the first movement also applied to the second movement.

In general there was a definite indication that previous instruction relating to the stylistic analysis of the music did affect the manner in which the pupils responded when the music incorporated serial techniques, pointillism, atonality, and angular melodies which were disjunct and discontinuous.

On the other hand, previous instruction in historical and biographical information tended to reduce the tehdency to respond favorably to the less traditional works. In fact, simply hearing the music without any instruction tended to encourage more favorable responses.

When the music was more traditional, previous instruction and hearings had no significant effect on the manner in which the pupils responded. There was an indication that other factors enter into the picture, since responses to the more traditional music, the quintets of Persichetti and Etler, were more varied.

The Junior High Category

There was a total of 411 pupils in the junior high school category who took part in the study. They were divided into the four groups of the experimental design as follows:

Control Group - 117 pupils,
Experimental Group #1 - 98 pupils,
Experimental Group #2 - 83 pupils,
Experimental Group #3 - 113 pupils.

Table 7B-1 lists the preference responses to Composition # 1 (Persichetti - Pastoral) for the Junior High Category.

TABLE 7B-1

Summary of Preference Responses
Composition # 1 Junior High Category

GROUP	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean	Standard Deviation
Control	52	51	7	5	2	1.248	.873
Exp. Gp. #1	63	26	5	4	0	1.510	.771
Exp. Gp. #2	44	35	0	1	3	1.400	.861
Exp. Gp. #3	82	24	0	4	3	1.575	.691

The *t* scores, comparing the responses between the four groups, were as follows:

Between the Control Group and Experimental Group #1 - 2.298 - significant at the .995 level;
between the Control Group and Experimental Group #2 - 1.192 - significant at the .750 level;
between the Control Group and Experimental Group #3 - 2.817 - significant at the .995 level;
between Experimental Groups #1 and #2 - 0.922 - significant at the .750 level;
between Experimental Groups #2 and #3 - 0.563 - not significant;
between Experimental Groups #2 and #3 - 1.400 - significant at the .900 level.

There were significant differences between the responses of the Control Group and the three experimental groups of the Junior High Category for Composition # 1. In each case the experimental groups responded more favorably. The inference drawn from the data was that special instruction and previous hearings did affect the manner in which the pupils responded to the work. However, the effect of the different types of special instruction was inconclusive. The significant difference between the responses of Experimental Groups #1 and #3 and Experimental Group #2 did indicate that special instruction relating to historical and biographical information did not have as much affect as did previous hearings of the music. However, such a conclusion based only upon the data from one composition must be viewed with caution.

The Pastoral by Persichetti was a very lyrical work, in the style of late nineteenth century Romanticism. As the title suggested, the work was descriptive in character and pastoral associations could readily be made obvious to the pupil. It was diatonic and tonal (close to A major). The rhythmic element was prominent, especially in the middle section. The lyrical melodies were easy to remember and recall.

Table 7B-2 lists the preference responses to Composition # 2 (Diamond - Theme and Variations) for the Junior High Category.

TABLE 7B-2

Summary of Preference Responses
Composition # 2 Junior High Category

GROUP	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean	Standard Deviation
Control	8	27	25	32	25	-0.3333	1.235
Exp. Gp. #1	5	20	15	26	32	-0.6122	1.266
Exp. Gp. #2	9	19	8	33	14	-0.2891	1.287
Exp. Gp. #3	7	33	9	45	19	-0.3186	1.228

The t scores, comparing the responses between the four groups of the Junior High Category, were as follows:

Between the Control Group and Experimental Group #1 - 1.620 significant at the .900 level;
between the Control Group and Experimental Group #2 - 0.244 - not significant;
between the Control Group and Experimental Group #3 - 0.091 - significant at the .950 level;
between Experimental Groups #1 and #2 - 1.686 - significant at the .950 level;
between Experimental Groups #1 and #3 - 1.697 - significant at the .950 level;
between Experimental Groups #2 and #3 - 0.161 - not significant.

The responses to Composition # 2 by the pupils in the Junior High Category were generally unfavorable. And especially significant was the fact that those pupils who had received special instruction relating to the stylistic characteristics of the work reacted even less favorably than did the other three groups.

The inference was that, in this case, special instruction in the stylistic features of the work produced a significantly different response in a negative way.

The Diamond composition was a slow, highly structured, serial technique work. It was highly dissonant and very difficult to follow.

Table 7B-3 lists the preference responses to Composition # 3 (Etler - Mvt. I) for the Junior High Category.

TABLE 7B-3

Summary of Preference Responses
Composition # 3 Junior High Category

GROUP	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean	Standard Deviation
Control	15	37	28	20	17	0.1111	1.253
Exp. Gp. #1	11	29	21	22	15	-0.0102	1.257
Exp. Gp. #2	12	21	20	15	15	0.0000	1.316
Exp. Gp. #3	11	39	27	24	12	0.1150	1.166

The t scores, comparing the responses between the four groups, were as follows:

Between the Control Group and Experimental Group #1 - 0.702 - significant at the .750 level;
between the Control Group and Experimental Group #2 - 0.990 - significant at the .750 level;
between the Control Group and Experimental Group #3 - 0.582 - not significant;
between Experimental Groups #1 and #2 - 0.053 - not significant;
between Experimental Groups #1 and #3 - 0.746 - significant at the .750 level;
between Experimental Groups #2 and #3 - 0.642 - not significant.

The limited significance of the differences in responses between the Control Group and Experimental Groups #1 and #2, as well as the difference in the responses between Experimental Groups #1 and #3, was of such a low level that it was not considered to be of any real value. Hence it was concluded that there was no significant difference in responses to Composition

3 as a result of previous hearings and special instruction.

The Etler Quintet was basically traditional in style, emphasizing rhythmic activity. The first movement was slow.

Table 7B-4 lists the preference responses to Composition # 4 (Etler - Mvt. II) for the Junior High Category.

TABLE 7B-4

Summary of Preference Responses
Composition # 4 Junior High Category

GROUP	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean	Standard Deviation
Control	39	37	28	20	17	0.7778	.788
Exp. Gp. #1	27	40	13	9	9	0.6837	1.226
Exp. Gp. #2	21	38	12	7	5	0.7590	1.103
Exp. Gp. #3	32	54	10	15	2	0.8761	1.022

The t scores, comparing the responses between the four groups of the Junior High Category, were as follows:

Between the Control Group and Experimental Group #1 - 0.569 - not significant;
between the Control Group and Experimental Group #2 - 0.113 - not significant;
between the Control Group and Experimental Group #3 - 0.672 - not significant;
between Experimental Groups #1 and #2 - 0.4290 - not significant;
between Experimental Groups #1 and #3 - 1.235 - significant at the .750 level;
between Experimental Groups #2 and #3 - 0.761 - significant at the .750 level.

Again the significant differences notes were at such a low level that they were not considered to be of real value in assessing the affect of special instruction and previous hearing. Therefore, it was determined that previous hearings and special instruction did not significantly affect the manner in which the students responded to this movement of the Etler Quintet.

The second movement was fast in tempo. Stylistically it was similar to the other three movements.

Table 7B-5 lists the preference responses to Composition # 5 (Etler - Mvt. III) for the Junior High Category.

TABLE 7B-5

Summary of Preference Responses
Composition # 5 Junior High Category

GROUP	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean	Standard Deviation
Control	15	38	20	26	18	0.0513	1.293
Exp. Gp. #1	9	31	23	22	13	0.0102	1.199
Exp. Gp. #2	16	22	15	17	13	0.1325	1.360
Exp. Gp. #3	16	33	26	24	14	0.1150	1.246

The _t_ scores, comparing the responses between the four groups, were as follows:

Between the Control Group and Experimental Group #1 - 0.238 - not significant;
between the Control Group and Experimental Group #2 - 0.426 - not significant;
between the Control Group and Experimental Group #3 - 0.638 - not significant;
between Experimental Groups #1 and #2 - 0.638 - not significant;
between Experimental Groups #1 and #3 - 0.616 - not significant;
between Experimental Groups #2 and #3 - 0.093 - not significant.

There was no significant difference between the responses of any of the four groups to this movement. It was concluded that special instruction and previous hearing had no effect on the manner in which the pupils responded to this composition.

It should be noted that the pupils in the Junior High Category responded more favorably to the fast movements of the Etler _Quintet_ (Movements II and IV) than they did to the slow movements (Movements I and III).

Table 7B-6 lists the preference responses to Composition # 6 (Etler - Mvt. IV) for the Junior High Category.

TABLE 7B-6

Summary of Preference Responses
Composition # 6 Junior High Category

GROUP	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean	Standard Deviation
Control	37	42	19	13	6	0.7778	1.155
Exp. Gp. #1	41	33	11	7	6	0.9796	1.178
Exp. Gp. #2	41	20	7	9	6	0.9759	1.289
Exp. Gp. #3	38	50	11	10	4	0.9558	1.851

The t scores, comparing the responses between the four groups of the Junior High Category, were as follows:

Between the Control Group and Experimental Group #1 - 1.261 - significant at the .750 level;
between the Control Group and Experimental Group #2 - 1.131 - significant at the .750 level;
between the Control Group and Experimental Group #3 - 1.213 - significant at the .750 level;
between Experimental Groups #1 and #2 - 0.020 - not significant;
between Experimental Groups #1 and #3 - 0.155 - not significant;
between Experimental Groups #2 and #3 - 0.120 - not significant.

The significant differences between the responses of the Control Group and the three experimental groups were limited but consistent. The inference drawn from the review of the data was that there was a suggestion that previous hearings of the music could have had some effect on the manner in which the pupils in the experimental groups responded to this movement. Special instruction relating to styles analysis, and historical and biographical backgrounds had no apparent effect on the manner in which the pupils responded.

The fourth movement of the Etler Quintet was very fast. Stylistically it was similar to the first three movements.

Table 7B-7 lists the preference responses to Composition # 7 (Sydeman - Mvt. I) for the Junior High Category.

TABLE 7B-7

Summary of Preference Responses
Composition # 7 Junior High Category

GROUP	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean	Standard Deviation
Control	22	36	16	24	19	0.1538	1.377
Exp. Gp. #1	16	30	19	12	21	0.0816	1.390
Exp. Gp. #2	8	26	16	15	18	-0.1084	1.316
Exp. Gp. #3	16	26	25	25	21	-0.0796	1.322

The t scores, comparing the responses between the four groups, were as follows:

Between the Control Group and Experimental Group #1 - 0.379 - not significant;
between the Control Group and Experimental Group #2 - 1.342 - significant at the .900 level;
between the Control Group and Experimental Group #3 - 1.302 - significant at the .900 level;
between Experimental Groups #1 and #2 - 0.9329 - significant at the .750 level;
between Experimental Groups #1 and #3 - 0.856 - significant at the .750 level;
between Experimental Groups #2 and #3 - 0.622 - not significant.

The Control Group responded more favorably to the first movement of the Sydeman Quintet than did those in the three experimental groups. However, the responses of the Control Group and Experimental Group #1 were not significantly different. A liberal interpretation of the analysis suggested that previous hearing tended to elicit a less favorable response from the Junior High Category on a second hearing, with the idea that special instruction relating to the stylistic characteristics of the music tended to reduce the tendency to react less favorably. Such an interpretation must be viewed with caution when attempting to generalize, however.

The first movement of the Sydeman had a slow introduction followed by a fast middle section and a slow ending. As previously stated, it can be described as an example of post-Webern pointillism with a high degree of dissonance present.

Table 7B-8 lists the preference responses to Composition # 8 (Sydeman - Mvt. II) for the Junior High Category.

TABLE 7B-8

Summary of Preference Responses
Composition # 8 Junior High Category

GROUP	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean	Standard Deviation
Control	65	24	9	7	12	1.0513	1.339
Exp. Gp. #1	55	19	4	13	7	1.0508	1.334
Exp. Gp. #2	42	25	7	3	6	1.1325	1.170
Exp. Gp. #3	58	36	9	7	3	1.2301	1.013

The t scores, comparing the responses between the four groups of the Junior High Category, were as follows:

Between the Control Group and Experimental Group #1 - 0.060 - not significant;
between the Control Group and Experimental Group #2 - 0.441 - not significant;
between the Control Group and Experimental Group #3 - 1.134 - significant at the .750 level;
between Experimental Groups #1 and #2 - 0.486 - not significant;
between Experimental Groups #1 and #3 - 1.166 - significant at the .750 level;
between Experimental Groups #2 and #3 - 0.622 - not significant.

The significant differences between the responses of Experimental Group #3, and the Control Group and Experimental Group #1 were of a level that was not considered to be of a real value in determining the effect of previous hearing and special instruction on the responses of the junior high pupils. Therefore, it was determined that previous hearing and special instruction had no effect on the manner in which the pupils in the four groups responded to Composition # 8.

It should be noted that all four groups responded in a more favorable manner to the second movement of the Sydeman Quintet than they did to the first movement.

In general it was determined that special instruction had no effect on the manner in which the junior high pupils responded to the four woodwind quintets. There was a limited amount of evidence which suggested that previous hearings might have had some effect on the way which the pupils in the experimental groups responded, but the evidence was inconclusive and any such judgment must be accepted very cautiously.

The Senior High Category

There was a total of 402 students in the senior high school category who took part in all phases of the study. They were divided into the four groups of the experimental design as follows:

Control Group - 85 students;
Experimental Group #1 - 113 students;
Experimental Group #2 - 61 students;
Experimental Group #3 - 143 students.

An additional 25 students were originally included in Experimental Group #2. They received the special instruction and heard the tape recording of the music being presented on the concert. However, they did not attend the concert, so they were not considered to have been a part of the study for the purposes of the statistical analysis.

Table 7C-1 lists the preference responses to Composition # 1 (Persichetti - Pastoral) for the Senior High Category.

TABLE 7C-1

Summary of Preference Responses
Composition # 1 Senior High Category

GROUP	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean	Standard Deviation
Control	55	30	0	0	0	1.647	.520
Exp. Gp. #1	61	48	0	3	1	1.460	.717
Exp. Gp. #2	40	19	1	1	0	1.607	.599
Exp. Gp. #3	82	57	2	1	1	1.524	.522

The t scores, comparing the responses between the four groups in the Senior High Category, were as follows:

Between the Control Group and Experimental Group #1 - 2.057 - significant at the .975 level;
between the Control Group and Experimental Group #2 - 0.451 - not significant;
between the Control Group and Experimental Group #3 - 1.525 - significant at the .900 level;
between Experimental Groups #1 and #2 - 1.340 - significant at the .900 level;
between Experimental Groups #1 and #3 - 0.749 - significant at the .750 level;
between Experimental Groups #2 and #3 - 0.845 - significant at the .750 level.

There were significant differences in the responses between the Control Group and Experimental Groups #1 and #3. In a discussion of the relationship of Experimental Group #2 to the other groups one point needs to be made clear. As previously mentioned 25 students who were originally a part of Experimental Group #2 did not attend the concert. The instructor of the group indicated that the students did not attend school on the day of the concert. It was also suggested by the instructor that those students probably did not wish to participate further in the research program because of lack of interest in the music being performed. Therefore the researcher concluded that, had they been in attendance, they would have tended to respond in such a manner as to lower the mean response of Experimental Group #2. If such had been the case the mean response of Experimental Group #2 would have been somewhat lower and probably similar to the mean responses of Experimental Groups #1 and #3. Because of this fact all inferences or conclusions relating to the responses of Experimental Group #2 must be viewed with caution. In consideration of the probably distortion of the mean response of Experimental Group #2 in relation to the other groups, the researcher concluded that previous hearings and special instruction did have a limited effect on the responses of those in the experimental groups. The effect was to elicit a less favorable response for Composition # 1.

Table 7C-2 lists the preference responses to Composition # 2 (Diamond - Theme and Variations) for the Senior High Category.

TABLE 7C-2

Summary of Preference Responses
Composition # 2 Senior High Category

GROUP	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean	Standard Deviation
Control	1	8	6	28	42	-1.2000	1.004
Exp. Gp. #1	4	10	13	43	43	-0.9823	1.074
Exp. Gp. #2	2	10	6	27	16	-0.7377	1.024
Exp. Gp. #3	8	19	25	44	47	-0.7203	1.122

The t scores, comparing the responses between the four groups in the Senior High Category, were as follows:

Between the Control Group and Experimental Group #1 - 1.440 - significant at the .900 level;
between the Control Group and Experimental Group #2 - 2.606 - significant at the .990 level;
between the Control Group and Experimental Group #3 - 3.067 - significant at the .995 level;
between Experimental Groups #1 and #2 - 1.399 - significant at the .900 level;
between Experimental Groups #1 and #3 - 1.792 - significant at the .950 level;
between Experimental Groups #2 and #3 - 0.0963 - not significant.

There were significant differences between the responses of the Control Group and those in the three experimental groups. While all mean responses were negative the Control Group responded less favorably than did the other groups. The significant difference between the responses of those in Experimental Groups #1 and #3 suggested that there was a difference in the responses as a result of special instruction. The mean response of Experimental Group #2 was considered distorted and not considered reliable. Had the additional 25 students been present the researcher estimated that the mean response would have been closer to that of Experimental Group #1.

It was concluded that previous hearing did have an effect on the manner in which the students reacted to Composition # 2, having the tendency to encourage a more favorable response. The special instruction was also determined to have had an effect, however, the effect was considered to be a negative one.

Table 7C-3 lists the preference responses to Composition # 3 (Etler - Mvt. I) for the Senior High Category.

TABLE 7C-3

Summary of Preference Responses
Composition # 3 Senior High Category

GROUP	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean	Standard Deviation
Control	6	31	23	16	9	0.1059	1.117
Exp. Gp. #1	7	38	36	24	8	0.1062	1.033
Exp. Gp. #2	4	20	18	15	4	0.0820	1.045
Exp. Gp. #3	11	27	45	35	25	-0.2517	1.174

The t scores, comparing the responses between the four groups in the Senior High Category, were as follows:

Between the Control Group and Experimental Group #1 - 0.002 - not significant;
between the Control Group and Experimental Group #2 - 0.130 - not significant;
between the Control Group and Experimental Group #3 - 2.252 - significant at the .975 level;
between Experimental Groups #1 and #2 - 0.146 - not significant;
between Experimental Groups #1 and #3 - 2.540 - significant at the .990 level;
between Experimental Groups #2 and #3 - 1.908 - significant at the .950 level.

Here the only significant difference in responses occurred between Experimental Group #3 and the other three groups. Those in Experimental Group #3 responded less favorably than did those in the other three groups. The findings suggested that previous hearing and special instruction did have an effect on the manner in which the students responded to Composition # 3. The inference was that while previous hearing tended to lower the mean response of the group, special instruction served to offset the less favorable reaction to a second hearing of the composition.

Table 7C-4 lists the preference responses to Composition # 4 (Etler - Mvt. II) for the Senior High Category.

TABLE 7C-4

Summary of Preference Responses
Composition # 4 Senior High Category

GROUP	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean	Standard Deviation
Control	19	43	10	9	4	0.7529	1.062
Exp. Gp. #1	23	48	21	18	3	0.6195	1.058
Exp. Gp. #2	9	28	15	9	0	0.6066	.912
Exp. Gp. #3	27	59	27	21	9	0.5175	1.139

The t scores, comparing the responses between the four groups in the Senior High Category, were as follows:

> Between the Control Group and Experimental Group #1 - 0.872 - significant at the .750 level;
> between the Control Group and Experimental Group #2 - 0.863 - significant at the .750 level;
> between the Control Group and Experimental Group #3 - 1.537 - significant at the .900 level;
> between Experimental Groups #1 and #2 - 0.080 - not significant;
> between Experimental Groups #1 and #3 - 0.730 - significant at the .750 level;
> between Experimental Groups #2 and #3 - 0.538 - not significant.

The differences in responses between the responses of the Control Group and the three experimental groups were of limited significance. While the significance was limited they tended to follow the pattern established for Composition # 3 (the first movement of the Etler Quintet). Hence it was concluded that previous hearing did have a limited effect on the manner in which the students responded to Composition # 4. The effect was to tend to lower the mean response of the group, with special instruction serving to offset the less favorable reaction to a second hearing.

Table 7C-5 lists the preference responses to Composition # 5 (Etler - Mvt. III) for the Senior High Category.

TABLE 7C-5

Summary of Preference Responses
Composition # 5 Senior High Category

GROUP	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean	Standard Deviation
Control	12	27	19	21	6	0.2118	1.168
Exp. Gp. #1	11	38	30	23	11	0.1327	1.141
Exp. Gp. #2	8	29	11	11	2	0.4918	1.033
Exp. Gp. #3	18	36	42	29	18	0.0490	1.208

The t scores, comparing the responses between the four groups in the Senior High Category, were as follows:

Between the Control Group and Experimental Group #1 - 0.474 - not significant;
between the Control Group and Experimental Group #2 - 1.487 - significant at the .900 level;
between the Control Group and Experimental Group #3 - 0.990 - significant at the .750 level;
between Experimental Groups #1 and #2 - 2.032 - significant at the .975 level;
between Experimental Groups #1 and #3 - 0.562 - not significant;
between Experimental Groups #2 and #3 - 2.484 - significant at the .990 level.

Again the researcher concluded that the mean response of Experimental Group #2 was somewhat distorted, affecting the significance of the difference in responses. The difference in mean responses between the Control Group and Experimental Group #3 was of limited significance. As in the case of the conclusions based on observations of the responses to the first two movements of the Etler Quintet, the researcher concluded that previous hearing did affect the manner in which the students responded to the work, tending to lower the mean responses of the experimental groups. This tendency was offset by the effect of special instruction which tended to encourage a more favorable reaction from the students.

Table 7C-6 lists the preference responses to Composition # 6 (Etler - Mvt. IV) for the Senior High Category.

TABLE 7C-6

Summary of Preference Responses
Composition # 6 Senior High Category

GROUP	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean	Standard Deviation
Control	27	36	12	9	1	0.9294	1.076
Exp. Gp. #1	30	26	17	23	7	0.5221	1.258
Exp. Gp. #2	29	23	11	4	3	0.8689	1.097
Exp. Gp. #3	31	61	20	24	7	0.5944	1.143

The t scores, comparing the responses between the four groups in the Senior High Category, were as follows:

Between the Control Group and Experimental Group #1 - 2.460 - significant at the .990 level;
between the Control Group and Experimental Group #2 - 0.346 - not significant;
between the Control Group and Experimental Group #3 - 2.234 - significant at the .975 level;
between Experimental Groups #1 and #2 - 1.809 - significant at the .950 level;
between Experimental Groups #1 and #3 - 0.480 - not significant;
between Experimental Groups #2 and #3 - 1.583 - significant at the .900 level.

The difference in mean responses between the Control Group and Experimental Groups #1 and #3 were significant. Again the researcher concluded that the mean responses of Experimental Group #2 was somewhat distorted and was therefore not reliable. The researcher concluded that previous hearing had an effect on the manner in which the students responded to the music. Again the effect was a tendency to lower the mean responses of the experimental groups. Special instruction was considered to have had no effect on the manner in which the students responded.

Table 7C-7 lists the preference responses to Composition # 7 (Sydeman - Mvt. I) for the Senior High Category.

TABLE 7C-7

Summary of Preference Responses

Composition # 7 Senior High Category

GROUP	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean	Standard Deviation
Control	6	25	16	27	11	-0.1412	1.180
Exp. Gp. #1	10	21	19	27	36	-0.5133	1.337
Exp. Gp. #2	6	10	10	23	12	-0.4098	1.246
Exp. Gp. #3	7	33	28	38	37	-0.4545	1.233

The t scores, comparing the responses between the four groups in the Senior High Category, were as follows:

Between the Control Group and Experimental Group #1 - 2.024 - significant at the .975 level;
between the Control Group and Experimental Group #2 - 1.316 - significant at the .900 level;
between the Control Group and Experimental Group #3 - 1.874 - significant at the .950 level;
between Experimental Groups #1 and #2 - 0.4942 - not significant;
between Experimental Groups #1 and #3 - 0.362 - not significant;
between Experimental Groups #2 and #3 - 0.235 - not significant.

There were significant differences in the mean responses between the Control Group and the three experimental groups. The mean responses between the three experimental groups were not significantly different. Again the researcher concluded that previous hearing had an effect on the manner in which the students responded. The effect was to lower the mean response of those groups which had heard the composition prior to coming to the concert. Special instruction was determined to have had no effect on the manner in which the students responded.

Table 7C-8 lists the preference responses to Composition # 8 (Sydeman - Mvt. II) for the Senior High Category.

TABLE 7C-8

Summary of Preference Responses
Composition # 8 Senior High Category

GROUP	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean	Standard Deviation
Control	30	31	6	12	6	0.7882	1.256
Exp. Gp. #1	25	35	15	19	19	0.2478	1.405
Exp. Gp. #2	20	17	9	5	10	0.5246	1.433
Exp. Gp. #3	25	51	9	27	31	0.0839	1.452

The t scores, comparing the responses between the four groups in the Senior High Category, were as follows:

Between the Control Group and Experimental Group #1 - 2.783 - significant at the .997 level;
between the Control Group and Experimental Group #2 - 1.170 - significant at the .750 level;
between the Control Group and Experimental Group #3 - 3.704 - significant at the .995 level;
between Experimental Groups #1 and #2 - 1.223 - significant at the .750 level;
between Experimental Groups #1 and #3 - 0.906 - significant at the .750 level;
between Experimental Groups #2 and #3 - 1.982 - significant at the .950 level.

There were significant differences in the mean responses between the Control Group and the three experimental groups. The differences in mean responses between the three experimental groups were also significant. (Again, considering the idea that the mean response of Experimental Group #2 was distorted, any conclusions drawn must be viewed with caution.) As a result of the significance of the statistical differences, the researcher concluded that the inference was again appropriate, namely, that previous hearing had the tendency to lower the mean response of Experimental Group #3. It was also concluded that special instruction served to offset the tendency to respond less favorably as a result of a previous hearing.

In general, the researcher concluded that a previous hearing did have an effect on the manner in which the students responded to the four woodwind quintets. With the exception of their responses to the one movement of the Diamond Quintet, the students in the experimental groups tended to respond less favorably than did those in the Control Group. A second inference was drawn from the data, namely, that the specialized instruction tended to have the effect of offsetting the less favorable responses due to previous hearings. This idea was clouded by the researcher's lack of faith in the data from the Experimental Group #2 in the Senior High Category. However, if the researcher's conclusions about the distortion of the data from Experimental Group #2 were unjustified and the addition of the other 25 students would have had no effect upon the mean responses, this would serve to strengthen the conclusion that special instruction did encourage students to respond more favorably to the music.

Due to the "cloud" which the researcher has placed over the data from Experimental Group #2, no conclusion can be drawn as to the relative merits of special instruction in stylistic characteristics and historical and biographical backgrounds of the music, composers and woodwind quintet.

Comparison of Differences in Preference Responses Between Categories.

To gain a better insight into the manner in which the age-educational level of the pupil affected the way in which he responded to the music, it was necessary to analyze the responses of the pupils in the three categories within the same group. By comparing the mean responses of those in the Elementary, Junior High, and Senior High Categories within each group of the experimental design, any patterns of response which were reflected within the various age groups would become apparent.

This part of the analysis was carried out by utilizing the t Test to determine the significant differences in mean responses between each category and the other two categories for each composition. The following discussion considered each group of the experimental design for each composition presented at the concert.

Composition # 1)Persichetti - Pastoral). Tables 7D-1 through 7D-4 list the summary of preference responses for each group of the experimental design. The t scores, indicating the statistical significance of the differences between mean responses for each group are listed immediately following the pertinent table.

Those pupils in the Elementary Category within each group in the experimental design responded more favorably to Composition #1 than did those in the Junior High and Senior High Categories. In every case there was a significant difference between the Elementary Categories and the Junior High Categories. In the case of Experimental Group #3, the level of significance was low, however, since the pattern of response was so clear, it was of significance.

The pattern was not as clear in comparing the mean responses of the Elementary Categories with those of the Senior High Categories. The level of significance between the mean responses for the Elementary and Senior High Categories in the Control Group was low. However, those in the Elementary Categories had the highest mean responses in all four groups.

The levels of significance were somewhat lower when comparing the mean responses of the Junior High and Senior High Categories in each group. In only one group, Experimental Group #3, was the difference in mean responses significant. In two groups, the Control Group and Experimental Group #2, the mean responses of the Senior High Category were higher. In general, the Junior High and Senior High Categories did not respond in a significantly different way to Composition #1.

The Persichetti composition was stylistically in the tradition of the Nineteenth century.

TABLE 7D-1

Summary of Preference Responses

Composition #1 Control Group

Category	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean	Standard Deviation
Elementary	81	16	0	3	1	1.713	0.715
Junior High	52	51	7	5	2	1.248	0.873
Senior High	55	30	0	0	0	1.647	0.520

The t scores, comparing the responses between the four categories in the Control Group, were as follows:

Between the Elementary and Junior High Categories - 4.236 - significant at the .995 level;
between the Elementary and Senior High Categories - 0.709 - significant at the .750 level;
between the Junior High and Senior High Categories - 3.792 - significant at the .995 level.

TABLE 7D-2

Summary of Preference Responses
Composition # 1 Experimental Group #1

Category	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean	Standard Deviation
Elementary	88	15	1	0	2	1.764	.655
Junior High	63	26	5	4	0	1.510	.771
Senior High	61	48	0	3	1	1.460	.717

The t scores, comparing the responses between the three categories in Experimental Group #1, were as follows:

Between the Elementary and Junior High Categories - 2.527 - significant at the .990 level;
between the Elementary and Senior High Categories - 3.252 - significant at the .995 level;
between the Junior High and Senior High Categories - 0.485 - not significant.

TABLE 7D-3

Summary of Preference Responses
Composition # 1 Experimental Group # 2

Category	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean	Standard Deviation
Elementary	101	29	4	0	0	1.724	.523
Junior High	44	35	-	1	3	1.400	.861
Senior High	40	19	1	1	0	1.607	.599

The t scores, comparing the responses between the three categories in Experimental Group #2, were as follows:

Between the Elementary and Junior High Categories - 3.455 - significant at the .995 level;
between the Elementary and Senior High Categories - 1.380 - significant at the .900 level;
between the Junior High and Senior High Categories - 1.605 - significant at the .900 level.

TABLE 7D-4

Summary of Preference Responses
Composition # 1 Experimental Group #3

Category	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean	Standard Deviation
Elementary	94	23	4	1	1	1.634	.789
Junior High	82	24	0	4	3	1.575	.691
Senior High	82	57	2	1	1	1.524	.522

The t scores, comparing the responses between the three categories in Experimental Group # 3, were as follows:

> Between the Elementary and Junior High Categories - 1.150 - significant at the .750 level;
> between the Elementary and Senior High Categories - 2.087 - significant at the .975 level;
> between the Junior High and Senior High Categories - 0.530 - not significant.

Composition # 2 (Diamond - Theme and Variations). Tables 7D-5 through 7D-8 list the summary of preference responses for each group of the experimental design. The t scores, indicating the statistical significance of the differences between mean responses for each group are listed immediately following the pertinent table.

The pattern of responses was much clearer with respect to Composition # 2. Within every group of the experimental design the Elementary Category had the highest mean response. In each case the mean responses indicated a preference for the composition.

Within every group the Senior High Category had the lowest mean response. And in each case the mean response was negative indicating a disliking for the composition.

In every case the differences between mean responses were highly significant. With regards to Composition # 2, each category of pupils responded in a significantly different way.

The Diamond composition utilized serial technique. It was very dissonant and very difficult to follow, both melodically and structurally.

TABLE 7D-5

Summary of Preference Responses
Composition # 2 Control Group

Category	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean	Standard Deviation
Elementary	19	25	17	22	18	0.0495	1.390
Junior High	8	27	25	32	25	-0.3333	1.235
Senior High	1	8	6	28	42	-1.2000	1.004

The t scores, comparing the responses between the three categories in the Control Group, were as follows:

Between the Elementary and Junior High Categories - 2.143 - significant at the .975 level;
between the Elementary and Senior High Categories - 6.869 - significant at the .995 level;
between the Junior High and Senior High Categories - 5.297 - significant at the .995 level.

TABLE 7D-6

Summary of Preference Responses
Composition # 2 Experimental Group #1

Category	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean	Standard Deviatiom
Elementary	34	26	15	28	3	0.5660	1.260
Junior High	5	20	15	26	32	-0.6122	1.266
Senior High	4	10	13	43	43	-0.9823	1.074

The t scores, comparing the responses between the three categories in Experimental Group #1, were as follows:

Between the Elementary and Junior High Categories - 6.620 - significant at the .995 level;
between the Elementary and Senior High Categories - 9.721 - significant at the .995 level;
between the Junior High and Senior High Categories - 2.276 - significant at the .975 level.

TABLE 7D-7

Summary of Preference Responses
Composition # 2 Experimental Group #2

Category	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean	Standard Deviation
Elementary	25	56	21	15	17	0.4254	1.266
Junior High	9	19	8	33	14	-0.2891	1.287
Senior High	2	10	6	27	16	-0.7377	1.024

The **t** scores, comparing the responses between the three categories in Experimental Group # 2, were as follows:

Between the Elementary and Junior High Categories - 3.993 - significant at the .995 level;
between the Elementary and Senior High Categories - 6.1290 - significant at the .995 level;
between the Junior High and Senior High Categories - 2.1710 - significant at the .975 level.

TABLE 7D-8

Summary of Preference Responses
Composition # 2 Experimental Group #3

Category	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean	Standard Deviation
Elementary	31	36	30	17	9	0.5122	1.213
Junior High	7	33	9	45	19	-0.3186	1.228
Senior High	8	19	25	44	47	-0.7203	1.122

The **t** scores, comparing the responses between the three categories in Experimental Group # 3, were as follows:

Between the Elementary and Junior High Categories - 5.199 - significant at the .995 level;
between the Elementary and Senior High Categories - 8.242 - significant at the .995 level;
between the Junior High and Senior High Categories - 2.607 - significant at the .995 level.

Composition # 3 (Etler - Quintet, Mvt. I). Tables 7D-9 through 7D-12 list the summary of preference responses for each group of the experimental design. The t scores, indicating the statistical significance of the differences between the mean responses for each group are listed immediately following the pertinent table.

In every case the differences in mean responses between the Elementary Category and the Junior High and Senior High Categories were highly significant. Again those in the Elementary Categories had the highest mean responses.

However, examination of the differences in mean responses between the Junior High and Senior High Categories, indicated considerable variety in the relationship. In two groups, the Control Group and Experimental Group #2, the differences in mean responses were not significant. In the case of Experimental Group #1, the Junior High Category had the lowest mean, however, the level of significance was low and of limited significance. Only in the case of Experimental Group #3 was the difference in the mean responses of any real significance. The Senior High Category responded to Composition # 3 in a significantly less favorable manner than did those in the Junior High Category. In general, the differences in mean responses between the Junior High and Senior High Categories were of limited significance, that is to say, they did not tend to respond in a significantly different manner.

Stylistically the Etler Quintet utilized traditional tonalities. Melodically it was diatonic and generally conjunct. The sonorities were only mildly dissonant. There was an emphasis on rhythmic activity. It was not a work in which the traditional mold was always clearcut and evident. It showed the influence of Hindemuth on the composer. The first movement was slow.

TABLE 7D-9

Summary of Preference Responses
Composition # 3 Control Group

Category	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean	Standard Deviation
Elementary	34	39	15	8	5	0.8812	1.112
Junior High	15	37	28	20	17	0.1111	1.253
Senior High	6	31	23	16	9	0.1059	1.117

The t scores, comparing the responses between the three categories in the Control Group, were as follows:

Between the Elementary and Junior High Categories - 4.743 - significant at the .995 level;
between the Elementary and Senior High Categories - 4.698 - significant at the .995 level;
between the Junior High and Senior High Categories - 0.031 - not significant.

TABLE 7D-10

Summary of Preference Responses
Composition # 3 Experimental Group #1

Category	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean	Standard Deviation
Elementary	41	29	17	6	13	0.7453	1.344
Junior High	11	29	21	22	15	-0.0102	1.257
Senior High	7	38	36	24	8	0.1062	1.033

The t scores, comparing the responses between the three categories in Experimental Group #1, were as follows:

Between the Elementary and Junior High Categories - 4.109 - significant at the .995 level;
between the Elementary and Senior High Categories - 3.930 - significant at the .995 level;
between the Junior High and Senior High Categories - 0.7326 - significant at the .750 level.

TABLE 7D-11

Summary of Preference Responses
Composition # 3 Experimental Group #2

Category	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean	Standard Deviation
Elementary	46	24	30	20	4	0.7313	1.167
Junior High	12	21	20	15	15	0.0000	1.316
Senior High	4	20	18	15	4	0.0820	1.045

The t scores, comparing the responses between the three categories in Experimental Group #2, were as follows:

Between the Elementary and Junior High Categories - 4.248 - significant at the .995 level;
between the Elementary and Senior High Categories - 3.701 - significant at the .995 level;
between the Junior High and Senior High Categories - 0.398 - not significant.

TABLE 7D-12

Summary of Preference Responses
Composition # 3 Experimental Group #3

Category	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean	Standard Deviation
Elementary	46	35	19	16	7	0.7886	1.232
Junior High	11	39	27	24	12	0.1150	1.166
Senior High	11	27	45	35	25	-0.2517	1.174

The t scores, comparing the responses between the three categories in Experimental Group #3, were as follows:

Between the Elementary and Junior High Categories - 4.284 - significant at the .995 level;
between the Elementary and Senior High Categories - 7.009 - significant at the .995 level;
between the Junior High and Senior High Categories - 2.478 - significant at the .990 level.

Composition # 4 (Etler - Quintet, Mvt.II). Tables 7D-13 through 7D-16 list the summary of preference responses for each group in the experimental design. The t scores, indicating the statistical significance of the differences between the mean responses for each group are listed immediately following the pertinent table.

In every case the differences in mean responses between the Elementary Category and the Junior High and Senior High Categories were highly significant. As before, those in the Elementary Categories in each group had the highest mean responses.

The differences in mean responses were not as evident in comparing the responses of the Junior High and Senior High Categories. The differences in mean responses between the two categories in the Control Group and Experimental Group #1 were not significant. The difference in mean responses for the same two categories in Experimental Group #2 were only of limited significance. However, the differences between mean responses for the Junior High and Senior High categories were much more significant in Experimental Group #3. Overall there was little difference in the mean responses of the Junior High and Senior High Categories.

The second movement of the Etler Quintet was fast.

TABLE 7D-13

Summary of Preference Responses
Composition # 4 Control Group

Category	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean	Standard Deviation
Elementary	59	29	10	3	0	1.4257	.788
Junior High	39	37	25	8	8	0.7778	.788
Senior High	19	43	10	9	4	0.7529	1.062

The t scores, comparing the responses between the three categories in the Control Group, were as follows:

Between the Elementary and Junior High Categories - 4.665 - significant at the .995 level;
between the Elementary and Senior High Categories - 4.919 - significant at the .995 level;
between the Junior High and Senior High Categories - 0.153 - not significant.

TABLE 7D-14

Summary of Preference Responses
Composition # 4 Experimental Group #1

Category	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean	Standard Deviation
Elementary	49	33	12	7	5	1.0755	1.121
Junior High	27	40	13	9	9	0.6837	1.226
Senior High	23	48	21	18	3	0.6195	1.058

The t scores, comparing the responses between the three categories in Experimental Group #1, were as follows:

Between the Elementary and Junior High Categories - 2.371 - significant at the .990 level;
between the Elementary and Senior High Categories - 3.078 - significant at the .995 level;
between the Junior High and Senior High Categories - 0.406 - not significant.

TABLE 7D-15

Summary of Preference Responses
Composition # 4 Experimental Group #2

Category	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean	Standard Deviation
Elementary	74	36	13	7	4	1.2612	1.028
Junior High	21	38	12	7	5	0.7590	1.103
Senior High	9	28	15	9	-	0.6066	.912

The t scores, comparing the responses between the three categories in Experimental Group #2, were as follows:

Between the Elementary and Junior High Categories - 3.378 - significant at the .995 level;
between the Elementary and Senior High Categories - 4.244 - significant at the .995 level;
between the Junior High and Senior High Categories - 0.874 - significant at the .750 level.

TABLE 7D-16

Summary of Preference Responses
Composition # 4 Experimental Group #3

Category	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean	Standard Deviation
Elementary	72	32	9	8	2	1.3333	.977
Junior High	32	54	10	15	2	0.8761	1.022
Senior High	27	59	27	21	9	0.5175	1.139

The t scores, comparing the responses between the three categories in Experimental Group #3, were as follows:

> Between the Elementary and Junior High Categories - 3.491 - significant at the .995 level;
> between the Elementary and Senior High Categories - 6.185 - significant at the .995 level;
> between the Junior High and Senior High Categories - 2.604 - significant at the .990 level.

Composition # 5 (Etler - Quintet, Mvt. III). Tables 7D-17 through 7D-20 list the summary of preference responses for each group of the experimental design. The t scores, indicating the statistical significance of the differences between the mean responses for each group are listed immediately following the pertinent table.

While not as significant as was the case for the first four compositions, the Elementary Category continued to have the highest mean responses in each group. This was not clear in examining the responses of the Elementary and Senior High Categories in Experimental Group #2. However, this again pointed out the probable distortion of the mean response for the Senior High Category in Experimental Group #2, hence the lack of any significant differences in the responses between the Elementary and Senior High Categories in that group were viewed with suspicion and was not considered important from the standpoint of the study. Those in the Elementary Category were considered to have responded in a significantly different manner than did those in the Senior High Category.

The differences in mean responses between the Elementary and Junior High Categories were significant in every case. Therefore, the pupils in the Elementary Category were considered to have responded in a significantly different manner than did their counterparts in the Junior High Category.

The differences in mean responses between the Junior High and Senior High categories were of limited significance. In the case of the two categories in Experimental Group #3 there was no significant difference in the way in which the Junior High and Senior High Categories responded to the music. Again it was determined that there was only a limited significance in the difference between the manner in which the Junior High and Senior High categories responded to the third movement of the Etler _Quintet_.

The third movement was an adagio movement.

TABLE 7D-17

Summary of Preference Responses
Composition # 5 Control Group

Category	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean	Standard Deviation
Elementary	29	28	18	19	7	0.5247	1.272
Junior High	15	38	20	26	18	0.0513	1.293
Senior High	12	27	19	21	6	0.2118	1.168

The _t_ scores, comparing the responses between the three categories in the Control Group, were as follows:

Between the Elementary and Junior High Categories - 2.698 - significant at the .995 level;
between the Elementary and Senior High Categories - 1.724 - significant at the .950 level;
between the Junior High and Senior High Categories - 0.900 - significant at the .750 level.

TABLE 7D-18

Summary of Preference Responses
Composition # 5 Experimental Group #1

Category	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean	Standard Deviation
Elementary	29	20	27	18	12	0.3396	1.337
Junior High	9	31	23	22	13	0.0102	1.199
Senior High	11	38	30	23	11	0.1327	1.141

The t scores, comparing the responses between the three categories in Experimental Group #1, were as follows:

Between the Elementary and Junior High Categories - 1.834 - significant at the .950 level;
between the Elementary and Senior High Categories - 1.226 - significant at the .750 level;
between the Junior High and Senior High Categories - 0.756 - significant at the .750 level.

TABLE 7D-19

Summary of Preference Responses
Composition # 5 Experimental Group #2

Category	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean	Standard Deviation
Elementary	34	35	32	20	13	0.4254	1.141
Junior High	16	22	15	17	13	0.1325	1.360
Senior High	8	29	11	11	2	0.4918	1.033

The t scores, comparing the responses between the three categories in Experimental Group #2, were as follows:

Between the Elementary and Junior High Categories - 1.589 - significant at the .900 level;
between the Elementary and Senior High Categories - 0.354 - not significant;
between the Juhior High and Senior High Categories - 1.713 - significant at the .950 level.

TABLE 7D-20

Summary of Preference Responses
Composition # 5 Experimental Group #3

Category	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean	Standard Deviation
Elementary	36	30	27	21	9	0.5122	1.272
Junior High	16	33	26	24	14	0.1150	1.246
Senior High	18	36	42	29	18	0.0490	1.208

The t scores, comparing the responses between the three categories in Experimental Group #3, were as follows:

Between the Elementary and Junior High Categories - 2.406 - significant at the .990 level;
between the Elementary and Senior High Categories - 3.029 - significant at the .995 level;
between the Junior High and Senior High Categories - 0.426 - not significant.

Composition # 6 (Etler - Quintet, Mvt. IV). Tables 7D-21 through 7D-24 list the summary of preference responses for each group of the experimental design. The t scores, indicating the statistical significance of the differences between the mean responses for each group are listed immediately following the pertinent table.

While the differences between mean responses of the Elementary Category and the Junior High and Senior High Categories were not as significant as in some of the preceding discussions, in every group the Elementary Category was considered to have responded significantly different than the other two categories. In every case the mean response of the Elementary Category was higher than the mean responses of the other two categories.

Again the pattern was inconsistent when the differences in the mean responses of the Junior High and Senior High Categories were examined. The differences in responses between the Junior High Category and the Senior High Category (with a higher mean response) in the Control Group was of a limited significance. However, the differences in mean responses of the two categories in both Experimental Groups #1 and #3 were considered to be highly significant. The probable distortion of the mean response of the Senior High Category in Experimental Group #2 made the lack of significant difference there of little import. In general the researcher determined that the Junior High and Senior High Categories did tend to respond in a significantly different way to Composition # 6.

The fourth movement of the Etler _Quintet_ was vivace, very fast. It was noteworthy to observe that all three categories responded more favorably to the two fast movements (II and IV) than they did to the slow movements (I and III).

TABLE 7D-21

Summary of Preference Responses
Composition # 6 Control Group

Category	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean	Standard Deviation
Elementary	58	23	10	7	3	1.2475	1.076
Junior High	37	42	19	13	6	0.7778	1.155
Senior High	27	36	12	9	1	0.9294	1.076

The _t_ scores, comparing the responses between the three categories in the Control Group, were as follows:

Between the Elementary and Junior High Categories - 3.073 - significant at the .995 level;
between the Elementary and Senior High Categories - 2.067 - significant at the .975 level;
between the Junior High and Senior High Categories - 0.971 - significant at the .750 level.

TABLE 7D-22

Summary of Preference Responses
Composition # 6 Control Group

Category	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean	Standard Deviation
Elementary	62	22	7	9	6	1.1792	1.076
Junior High	41	33	11	7	6	0.9796	1.178
Senior High	30	26	17	23	7	0.5221	1.258

The _t_ scores, comparing the responses between the three categories in Experimental Group #1, were as follows:

Between the Elementary and Junior High Categories - 1.190 - significant at the .750 level;
between the Elementary and Senior High Categories - 3.992 - significant at the .995 level;
between the Junior High and Senior High Categories - 2.716 - significant at the .995 level.

TABLE 7D-23

Summary of Preference Responses

Composition # 6 Experimental Group #2

Category	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean	Standard Deviation
Elementary	80	32	10	9	3	1.3209	1.018
Junior High	41	20	7	9	6	0.9759	1.289
Senior High	29	23	11	4	3	0.8689	1.097

The t scores, comparing the responses between the three categories in Experimental Group #2, were as follows:

Between the Elementary and Junior High Categories - 2.173 - significant at the .975 level;
between the Elementary and Senior High Categories - 2.788 - significant at the .995 level;
between the Junior High and Senior High Categories - 0.521 - not significant.

TABLE 7D-24

Summary of Preference Responses

Composition # 6 Experimental Group #3

Category	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean	Standard Deviation
Elementary	68	27	17	8	3	1.2114	1.063
Junior High	38	50	11	10	4	0.9558	1.051
Senior High	31	61	20	24	7	0.5944	1.143

The t scores, comparing the responses between the three categories in Experimental Group #3, were as follows:

Between the Elementary and Junior High Categories - 1.850 - significant at the .950 level;
between the Elementary and Senior High Categories - 4.516 - significant at the .995 level;
between the Junior High and Senior High Categories - 2.590 - significant at the .990 level.

Composition # 7 (Sydeman - Quintet, Mvt. I). Tables 7D-25 through 7D-28 list the summary of preference responses for each group of the experimental design. The t scores, indicating the statistical significance of the differences between the mean responses for each group are listed immediately following the pertinent table.

The pattern of responses was much clearer with respect to Composition # 7. Within every group of the experimental design the Elementary Category had the highest mean response. In each case the mean responses indicated a preference for the composition.

Within every group the Senior High Category had the lowest mean response. And in each case the mean response was negative indicating a disliking or lack of preference for the composition.

In every case the differences between mean responses were highly significant. With regards to Composition # 7, each category of pupils responded in a significantly different way.

The Sydeman Quintet was the most controversial and "difficult" work of the four performed at the concert, primarily because of its "discontinuity." The emphasis was linear, and melodically and rhythmically it was choppy and fragmentary. Being pointillistic it was devoid of motific thematic development which was present in the music of Etler and Persichetti. The first movement had a slow introduction, fast middle section and slow ending.

TABLE 7D-25

Summary of Preference Responses

Composition # 7 Control Group

Category	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean	Standard Deviation
Elementary	33	36	9	13	10	0.6832	1.313
Junior High	22	36	16	24	19	0.1538	1.377
Senior High	6	25	16	27	11	-0.1412	1.180

The t scores, comparing the responses between the three categories in the Control Group, were as follows:

Between the Elementary and Junior High Categories - 2.879 - significant at the .995 level;
between the Elementary and Senior High Categories - 4.434 - significant at the .995 level;
between the Junior High and Senior High Categories - 1.586 - significant at the .900 leve.

TABLE 7D-26

Summary of Preference Responses
Composition # 7 Experimental Group #1

Category	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean	Standard Deviation
Elementary	47	27	13	13	6	0.9057	1.248
Junior High	16	30	19	12	21	0.0816	1.390
Senior High	10	21	19	27	36	-0.5133	1.337

The t scores, comparing the responses between the three categories in Experimental Group #1, were as follows:

Between the Elementary and Junior High Categories - 4.433 - significant at the .995 level;
between the Elementary and Senior High Categories - 8.054 - significant at the .995 level;
between the Junior High and Senior High Categories - 3.146 - significant at the .995 level.

TABLE 7D-27

Summary of Preference Responses
Composition # 7 Experimental Group #2

Category	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean	Standard Deviation
Elementary	38	38	23	18	17	0.4527	1.358
Junior High	8	26	16	15	18	-0.1084	1.316
Senior High	6	10	10	23	12	-0.4098	1.246

The t scores, comparing the responses between the three categories in Experimental Group #2, were as follows:

Between the Elementary and Junior High Categories - 3.026 - significant at the .995 level;
between the Elementary and Senior High Categories - 4.239 - significant at the .995 level;
between the Junior High and Senior High Categories - 1.377 - significant at the .900 level.

TABLE 7D-28

Summary of Preference Responses
Composition # 7 Experimental Group #3

Category	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean	Standard Deviation
Elementary	48	24	24	12	15	0.6341	1.392
Junior High	16	26	25	25	21	-0.0796	1.322
Senior High	7	33	28	38	37	-0.4545	1.233

The t scores, comparing the responses between the three categories in Experimental Group #3, were as follows:

> Between the Elementary and Junior High Categories - 4.003 - significant at the .995 level;
> between the Elementary and Senior High Categories - 6.723 - significant at the .995 level;
> between the Junior High and Senior High Categories - 2.324 - significant at the .975 level.

Composition # 8 (Sydeman - Quintet, Mvt. II). Tables 7D-29 through 7D-32 list the summary of preference responses for each group of the experimental design. The t scores, indicating the statistical significance of the differences between the mean responses for each group are listed immediately following the pertinent table.

The same pattern of responses, which was evident in Composition # 2 (Diamond - Theme and Variations) and Composition # 7 (Sydeman - Mvt. I), was also quite apparent in the responses to Composition # 8.

In every case the differences between mean responses for every category were highly significant. Again the Elementary Category consistently had the highest mean responses and the Senior High Category, the lowest mean responses. All were positive indicating a general feeling of preference for the second movement of the Sydeman Quintet. Thus, it was determined that all categories responded in a significantly different manner to Composition # 8.

The second movement of the Sydeman Quintet was a scherzo, very fast.

TABLE 7D-29

Summary of Preference Responses
Composition # 8 Control Group

Category	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean	Standard Deviation
Elementary	62	25	7	5	2	1.3861	.954
Junior High	65	24	9	7	12	1.0513	1.339
Senior High	30	31	6	12	6	0.7882	1.256

The t scores, comparing the responses between the three categories in the Control Group, were as follows:

Between the Elementary and Junior High Categories - 2.083 - significant at the .975 level;
between the Elementary and Senior High Categories - 3.659 - significant at the .995 level;
between the Junior High and Senior High Categories - 1.407 - significant at the .900 level.

TABLE 7D-30

Summary of Preference Responses
Composition # 8 Experimental Group #1

Category	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean	Standard Deviation
Elementary	80	16	5	4	1	1.6038	.821
Junior High	55	19	4	13	7	1.0408	1.334
Senior High	25	35	15	19	19	0.2478	1.405

The t scores, comparing the responses between the three categories in Experimental Group #1, were as follows:

Between the Elementary and Junior High Categories - 3.636 - significant at the .995 level;
between the Elementary and Senior High Categories - 8.597 - significant at the .995 level;
between the Junior High and Senior High Categories - 4.163 - significant at the .995 level.

TABLE 7D-31

Summary of Preference Responses
Composition # 8 Experimental Group #2

Category	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean	Standard Deviation
Elementary	91	24	5	6	8	1.3731	1.137
Junior High	42	25	7	3	6	1.1325	1.170
Senior High	20	17	9	5	10	0.5246	1.433

The t scores, comparing the responses between the three categories in Experimental Group #2, were as follows:

Between the Elementary and Junior High Categories - 1.491 - significant at the .990 level;
between the Elementary and Senior High Categories - 4.414 - significant at the .995 level;
between the Junior High and Senior High Categories- 2.778 - significant at the .995 level.

TABLE 7D-32

Summary of Preference Responses
Composition # 8 Experimental Group #3

Category	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	Mean	Standard Deviation
Elementary	85	27	5	4	2	1.5366	.849
Junior High	58	36	9	7	3	1.2301	1.013
Senior High	25	51	9	27	31	0.0839	1.452

The t scores, comparing the responses between the three categories in Experimental Group #3, were as follows:

Between the Elementary and Junior High Categories - 2.509 - significant at the .990 level;
between the Elementary and Senior High Categories - 9.720 - significant at the .995 level;
between the Junior High and Senior High Categories - 7.111 - significant at the .995 level.

The pattern of responses of the pupils in all categories were significantly different when the music was stylistically unrelated to traditional sounds. When the more modern techniques, namely, serial technique, atonality, pointillism, high degree of dissonance, were employed each age-educational level responded in a significantly different way. The Elementary Category showed a greater preference for the Diamond and Sydeman compositions than did the other two categories.

The distinction was not as clear when the music contained more traditional sounds. Patterns of response were much less distinct in the reactions to the Persichetti and Etler compositions.

All categories showed a preference for faster tempi. They responded more favorably to the faster movements of the Etler and Sydeman Quintets. The implications of these findings and the others reported in connection with the specific compositions will be discussed at greater length in the next chapter.

VI

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

The purpose of the research was to study the relation between the stylistic features of contemporary American music and the aesthetic attitudes of auditors of the music, and to determine if certain independent variables affected the relationship. The concerts, at which the data for the study were collected, were devoted exclusively to the performance of music by American composers who have been active during the twentieth century. There was no real attempt to present music which adhered to specific stylistic patterns, rather the music performed covered a variety of styles representative of many of the divergent paths which have been taken by American composers of the last sixty years.

The conclusions drawn as a result of the study must be considered from the standpoint that there were no pre-conceived ideas as to how auditors would react to certain specific styles. Therefore, there was no attempt to select music for performance at each concert which would enable the researcher to arrive at any specific set of conclusions. Rather the compositions selected for performance were determined by the performing artists or the conductors of the performing groups without any reference to the researcher or to any patterns which he considered essential to the success of the study. Even in Part II of the study the selection of the compositions performed was made by the performing artists with only the overall length of the concert and the need for variety in musical styles being specified by the researcher.

The researcher had no means of regulating the makeup of the audiences at the concerts from which the data for Part I of the study were collected. Rather the researcher had to rely entirely upon the willingness of those in attendance to cooperate by revealing their personal reactions to the works that they heard. The fact that the Exposition of Contemporary American Music concerts were on successive evenings did have an effect on the collection of the data. At each successive concert there was a growing reluctance on the part of those in attendance to continue to respond to the questionnaires which were distributed. This was due to the fact that many persons attended two or more concerts. Thus the lower percentage of returns at the fifth concert (Cincinnati Symphony Orchestra concert) was due in part to the fact that auditors who had responded to the questionnaire at earlier concerts simply refused to go through the process a second or third time. Actually this was not detrimental to the research. Rather the responses actually obtained represented essentially different individuals at each concert. There was the definite practice by those in attendance not to respond to the questionnaire at not more than one or two concerts at the most. Thus the researcher determined that there was little duplication in the cumulative total of 807 usable questionnaires for the six concerts. This was important for it served to broaden the base from which the conclusions and implications were drawn.

It should also be noted that there was some negative reaction received from members of the audiences at the six concerts towards the questionnaire. This, of course, was expected. Many of the returned questionnaires were not usable because individuals objected to or lost interest in responding to all the music performed at a specific concert. In those cases where the researcher was able to determine, to some degree the background of the auditor, he observed that the person tended to be one who had a more extensive formal music training. However, the information contained on the questionnaires which were not completely filled out was too sparse to be able to draw any precise conclusions as to the backgrounds of the auditors who did not complete the questionnaire.

A basic assumption which was considered to be significant by the researcher, was that the audience at each of the six concerts of the Exposition was composed of persons who were interested in hearing or in becoming more familiar with contemporary American music. Individuals who had no interest in hearing contemporary American music probably were not in attendance at the concerts. This assumption was made only for those concerts utilized in Part I of the study.

Part I

The conclusions relating to Part I of the study represent generalizations based on the data collected at all six concerts. The conclusions are presented as answers to the questions posed at the beginning of the study.

1. What is the relation of the stylistic features of contemporary American music to the aesthetic attitudes of auditors of the music?

The auditors tended to react in a significantly different manner to works which stylistically were quite different. This was evident in the data from all six concerts. In the responses to the Index of Stylistic Characteristics, the auditors indicated that the following stylistic features were most important in the determination of their aesthetic attitudes towards the music.

A. The affective mood was more readily discernable in the compositions which were stylistically considered to be more traditional. There was considerable agreement as to the mood characteristics which were deemed to be most significant in the more traditional works. In the less traditional works, (namely those which were more dissonant, in which traditional structures were less evident, where the melodic lines were not easy to follow, in which angularity and/or pointillism were significant, where traditional tonalities and harmonies were not apparent) there were fewer responses to mood characteristics and a general lack of agreement as to what mood or moods were significant.

The auditors tended to relate mood to traditional sounds, those musical sounds and styles which have provided the bases for the great majority of past musical experiences, or the sounds and styles which they have heard most frequently. Thus, the tendency for the auditors to more readily relate mood characteristics to the styles which they could most easily comprehend was apparent. This suggested that auditors, in effect, "learn" to respond to affective mood and when specific moods were indicated they could react to those moods. However, if the mood was not specified and they could not relate the mood to previously "learned" music-mood patterns, there was considerable confusion as to what the affective mood actually was.

B. "Dissonant sounds" were considered to be an important stylistic consideration in those works where dissonance was determined by the styles analysts to be a significant characteristic of the music. In this sense dissonance was oftimes related to the works where the use of certain harmonies was restricted. For example, when quartal harmonies were used exclusively in a composition, dissonance was indicated as an important characteristic by a significant number of auditors. This does not say that quartal harmonies are examples of dissonant harmonies, rather that a significant number of auditors reacted to quartal harmonies by saying that they were dissonant. There was a definite tendency for the auditors to consider works in which certain harmonies were more pronounced, to be more consonant. This also suggested that auditors respond to consonance and dissonance in a general sense. Traditional harmonies, emphasizing triads and intervals of the third, fourth, fifth, sixth, minor seventh, and octave in ways which became common practice by the early part of the twentieth century, were accepted as being consonant. Again this implied a "learned" conditioning, as opposed to any "natural law" which might define consonance and dissonance. This was apparent in works which utilized serial technique in a conservative way, namely, employing the interval of the third with a high degree of frequency, both melodically and harmonically or contrapuntally.

C. When references to melodic characteristics were made, the phrases most commonly selected by the auditors were "lyric melody" and "irregular melodic contour, disjointed (angular)." "Lyric melody" was frequently selected as an important characteristic when the stylistic analysis of the music had indicated that the lyrical qualities of the melodic lines were pervading or significant. However, the selection of the "irregular melodic contour, disjointed (angular)" phrase was not as precise. For several works, on different concerts, this characteristic was listed as important by a significant number of auditors even when the melody was considered to be lyrical and generally conjunct. What appeared to happen was that the auditors, in selecting the characteristic of a disjointed melodic line, were reacting to a combination of melodic and harmonic devices. From the standpoint of texture an essentially conjunct melody would be employed over dissonant sonorities. The auditors tended to respond to this as an "irregular melodic contour, disjointed (angular)." Thus the effect was to say that melody which was not tonal in a traditional sense was irregular and disjointed, even though it might be a lyrical melody. In other words, a significant number of the auditors encountered difficulty in distinguishing between melody and harmony or counterpoint in the less traditional works. So whan a basically conjunct, lyric melody was used with dissonant harmonies or sonorities, the auditors had difficulty in discerning the melodic line.

D. In some cases the color or timbre of the performance medium was considered important by the auditors. This occurred most frequently when the concert provided for obvious contrasts between different performance media. For example, at the Fourth Concert, the choral concert, "voice/choral color" was considered to be important by a significant number of auditors in only one composition. On the other hand, at the concerts featuring instrumental groups, characteristics relating to instrumental color were frequently selected by a significant number of auditors as being important.

This suggests that instrumental colors frequently provided a basis for aesthetic responses. They also provided a basis for significant differences in responses between various groups of auditors. (This type of reaction will be discussed more in detail when conclusions are presented relating to responses by the auditors in terms of various independent variables.)

E. From a textural and structural standpoint, a significant number of auditors were readily able to distinquish contrapuntal textures. The recognition by the auditors of the importance of the characteristic "interweaving of melodies (contrapuntal)" in most of the contrapuntal works attests to this. In the pointillistic works the characteristic "disjointed series of sounds (pointillistic)" was considered important by a significant number of auditors. Also the characteristic "masses or blocks of sounds" was appropriately considered to be important in those works where the styles analysts had indicated that it was a pervading or significant characteristic.

Thus a significant number of auditors were readily able to select correctly those characteristics relating to texture and structure. The stressing of texture and structure occurred most frequently in those works which utilized dissonant masses of sounds. It was also important to note that auditors did not select characteristics relating to texture or structure with any significant degree of frequency when the work was obviously traditional in style or sound.

In general, the auditors at all concerts tended to correctly identify mood and music characteristics which were related to the specific composition. In every case there were a limited number of "incorrect" choices, namely, selection of characteristics which were not related to the composition. However, with one exception, such selections were too few in number to be considered significant. The one exception was the reference to "irregular melodic contour, disjointed (angular)", which was selected in error on several occasions. The apparent reasons for this "error in selection" has already been discussed.

When the formal music training of the auditor was considered, there was no significant difference between the number of "correct" and "incorrect" responses.

2. Does the independent variable, Occupation, affect the relationship?

In answering this question particular attention had to be given to the variety of occupational backgrounds of the auditors responding to the questionnaires at each of the six concerts. In each case the sample was composed primarily of professionals and college students. That a large number of auditors in the professional occupational groupings was expected was implied in the manner in which the Auditor's Occupation Scale was set up. The professional group was subdivided into four separate categories, namely, college professor, musician, elementary or high school teacher, and other professionals.

The occupational backgrounds of the auditors forming the sample for the six concerts were significant. While the Exposition of Contemporary American Music was presented in a large metropolitan area in which each grouping listed in the Auditor's Occupational Scale (with the possible exception of "farmer") was quite adequately represented, only two basic groupings, professional and college student, were large enough to be considered statistically significant. Since there was no conscious attempt made to exclude any one occupational grouping from the Exposition it may be concluded that individuals who had a real interest in contemporary American music were more likely to be members of a professional grouping or college students. This conclusion suggests that the population for which the contemporary American composer is writing is narrow and restricted. Such a premise was further supported by the sample at the Sixth Concert.

Here the audience had gathered to hear the Cincinnati Symphony Orchestra rather than a performance of works by contemporary American composers as played by the Cincinnati Symphony Orchestra. The music being performed was of secondary importance. And while the occupational backgrounds of the audience were more varied, college students (65 percent) and the four professional sub-groups (22 percent) accounted for 87 percent of the sample. Even though it could be readily assumed that some of those in attendance were reluctant to respond due to the makeup of the questionnaire, lack of interest in the music which they heard was probably the most significant reason for failure to respond. This was evident in the large humber of persons who left at the intermission.

Therefore, the manner in which the independent variable, Occupation, affected the responses of the auditors was limited essentially to any significant differences in the way in which professionals and college students responded to the music.

Significant differences were most frequently observed between the responses of "other professionals" and "musicians." In those works which were characterized as not traditional; being dissonant, with angular or disjointed melodic lines, lack of recognizable structure, sounding like atonal music, etc., those auditors in the "other professional" group tended to respond in a significantly different manner than did the "musicians" and "college studnts." (In general "musicians" and "college students" responded more favorably.)

However, the responses of "college students" did not always differ significantly from the responses of "other professionals." When characteristics relating to special effects were listed by the auditors with the greatest frequency, the mean preference responses of the "college students" and the "other professionals" were not significantly different. Here "musicians" tended to respond in a significantly different manner than did the "other professionals" and "college students." (The use of special effects was usually characterized by unusual orchestral effects or repetitive vocal effects.) The "musicians" tended to respond less favorably to the use of special effects than did the "other professionals" and "college students."

Thus the researcher concluded that "musicians" and "other professionals" differed significantly in their reactions to compositions emphasizing contemporary stylistic characteristics or special effects. However significant differences in the responses of "musicians" and "college students" occurred when special effects were employed by the composer.

The implication here was rather obvious, namely, that musicians viewed the use of special effects, as an important stylistic characteristic of a composition, with less favor than did other occupational groups.

Of equal importance was the implication that those in the "other professional" group were much more conservative in their reactions to works in which the newer stylistic characteristics were more pronounced. If they could not relate the music to traditional stylistic characteristics, their responses were less favorable. This did not necessarily relate to the idea of familiarity with the music, but probably to the more elusive idea of musical understanding.

One other implication was noted when comparing responses in terms of Occupation. At the Third Concert "college students" reacted in a significantly different way to the compositions of faculty members of the College-Conservatory of Music. This suggested that the auditor-composer relationship, or the manner in which the auditor associates himself with the composer had a significant effect on the way in which he responded to the music of that composer. (This implication was also suggested in a comparison of the responses to the music of Schuller and Johnston at the First Concert, Schuller being the more familiar composer to Cincinnati audiences.) More specifically the auditor-composer relationship suggested here was one in which the auditor felt a more personal association with the composer than normally expected. The composer was not merely the "writer of the music," rather he was an individual with whom the auditor was acquainted, however slightly, and therefore a person which the auditor could visualize or relate to in a broader sense. His sense of familiarity with and understanding of the composer went beyond that which could normally be encountered as a result of hearing and/or studying the composer's music.

3. Does the independent variable, Age Level, affect the relationship?

At each concert responses to certain compositions, in terms of Age Level, revealed significant differences in the mean responses of various age groups. However, there was no pattern of significant differences which was common to two or more concerts. This suggested that the Age Level of the auditor did not affect the relationship between the stylistic characteristics of the music and the aesthetic attitudes of the auditor to the extent the other variables did. When there was a significant difference, the statistical level of significance was generally low, suggesting that the differences in mean responses were not clear cut.

The analysis of the responses of the auditors at the Sixth Concert revealed the differences which were most significant. At this concert the 56 - 55 age group responded less favorably to each of the compositions than did the "21 or under" and "22 - 25" age groups. However, these three age groups were the only ones large enough to be of real value in the statistical analysis and any generalizations or conclusions made as a result of the differences in mean responses which did occur would be open to question as to their validity.

The researcher therefore concluded that the Age Level of the auditor did not significantly affect the manner in which he responded to the music heard. Any differences which did occur were the result of special circumstances which existed at each concert and did not follow any particular pattern.

4. Does the independent variable, Music Training, affect the relationship?

There was a pattern of mean responses, in terms of Music Training, which was present in the data from each of the six concerts. In the majority of compositions performed at the six concerts, the analysis of the data revealed that the auditors forming Music Training Category IV, as a group, responded most favorably to the music heard. (The auditors in Category IV were determined to have had extensive formal music training.) The least favorable responses were most likely to have come from those auditors in Music Training Category I (no formal music training) and Music Training Category V (highest degree of formal music training). A plot of the mean responses of the five categories would have tended to form a curve with the apex at Category IV, and with the mean response of Category I as the low point.

Thus the pattern most frequently observed found the low mean response coming from those with no formal music training. Successively higher mean responses came from those with limited formal music training and moderate formal music training. The highest mean response came from those with extensive formal music training. In the case of those with the highest degree of formal music training, their mean responses tended to be significantly lower than those with extensive formal music training. The exception to this pattern was observed primarily in the responses to some of the compositions which stressed contemporary stylistic characteristics, dissonance, angular or disjointed melody, lack of recognizable structure, etc. Here the mean responses of those with the highest degree of formal music training (Category V) and those with extensive formal music training (Category IV) did not tend to be significantly different. (The exceptions were noted primarily in relation to works performed at the First Concert.)

The researcher concluded that formal music training did significantly affect the manner in which auditors reacted to the music heard. As the amount of formal music training increased the auditor tended to respond more favorably to the music heard. Auditors with the highest degree of formal music training tended to respond less favorably to most compositions than did those with extensive music training. However, in compositions utilizing traditional performance media, such as the string quartet, those with the highest degree of formal music training did not differ significantly in their responses from those with extensive formal music training.

Such a conclusion implies that a basic understanding or knowledge of the significance of stylistic characteristics of a music composition will significantly affect the manner in which the auditor reacts to the composition.

5. Does the independent variable, Educational Attainment affect the relationship?

There were no patterns of response, in terms of Educational Attainment, which were observed in two or more concerts. In general, where significant differences in mean responses did occur, the level of significance was low. Significant differences were observed in only 15 of the 57 compositions performed at the six concerts.

The researcher concluded that Educational Attainment did not affect the manner in which auditors reacted to the music heard.

It should be noted, however, that the distribution of the auditors, in terms of Educational Attainment, placed the great majority of those who responded in groups which indicated college training to some degree. At every concert the majority of the auditors were in the "attended college, didn't graduate" and "college graduate" groups. Hence the study did not actually evaluate the responses of those whose Educational Attainment was limited to graduation from high school or less. At the same time there was generally no significant difference in the mean responses of those who had received master's or doctor's degrees and those who had received a less extensive formal education.

The researcher concluded that Educational Attainment did not affect the manner in which the auditors reacted to the music heard. The conclusion was limited to apply only to auditors who had received at least some formal college level education.

6. Does the independent variable, Familiarity, affect the relationship?

Since the responses to the Familiarity Scale were generally heavily skewed toward unfamiliarity, the statistical analysis of the data revealed little information relating to whether or not familiarity with a composition affected the manner in which the auditors reacted to the work. However, where the number of auditors indicating familiarity with a particular composition was large enough for the statistical analysis to be of value, there was no significant difference in the way the auditors reacted to the music. Thus, the reaearcher concluded that the fact that the auditor was familiar or unfamiliar with a composition did not affect the manner in which he responded to the work.

Part II

The conclusions drawn as a result of the analysis of the data from Part II of the study are generalizations based on the responses of the school children to all compositions performed at the special concert. The conclusions are presented as answere to the questions posed at the beginning of the study.

1. What is the relation of familiarity with the music, as a result of previous hearings, to the aesthetic attitudes of school children?

First of all, the reader is reminded that Experimental Groups #1, #2 and #3 heard each composition once prior to coming to the concert. They heard the taped recording during the period of five to ten days prior to the special concert.

Familiarity with the music, as a result of one previous hearing, did affect the manner in which the children in the Elementary Category responded to the four woodwind quintets. If the composition was dissonant, with disjointed and angular melodic lines, employing serial technique or pointillism as important stylistic features, the elementary school children responded more favorably to it as a result of a previous hearing. However, if the composition was more traditional sounding, employing traditional harmonies with diatonic or conjunct melodies, there was no significant difference in the manner in which the elementary school children responded to the music, as a result of a previous hearing.

The implications of this conclusion are especially significant. For it suggests that elementary school children can be encouraged to accept fairly readily newer and more diverse music which employs contemporary styles. That they tended to respond favorably to all four quintets indicates that their aesthetic attitudes are not developed to the degree that they are ready to reject compositions which do not conform to music styles already learned. The elementary school children listened to the music with an "open mind." Their prejudices, or likes and dislikes, had not been clearly established.

At the junior high level the evidence was not as clear cut. Only the Pastoral by Persichetti received a significantly more favorable response from those who had heard it prior to attending the concert. The responses to the two movements of the Sydeman quintet, indicated that a previous hearing might have had the effect of encouraging more favorable responses, however such a conclusion was questionable. The researcher concluded that previous hearings had only a very limited effect on the manner in which the pupils in the Junior High School Category responded to the music.

Such a conclusion suggested that junior high school pupils were not as susceptible to the newer music styles as were the elementary school children. While their aesthetic attitudes appeared to be somewhat fluid, they did not tend to respond in a more favorable manner to a composition simply because they had heard it before.

The students in the Senior High School Category did respond in a significantly different way as a result of a previous hearing. With the exception of their responses to the one movement of the Diamond quintet, those who had heard the music prior to attending the concert responded less favorably than did those who heard it for the first time. Thus, the researcher concluded that the previous hearing had the effect of encouraging significantly less favorable responses.

The responses of the students in the Senior High Category indicated that their aesthetic attitudes were more highly developed and their prejudices more clearly defined.

2. What is the relation of knowledge of the structural and stylistic features of the music to the aesthetic attitudes of school children?

The responses of the Elementary Category of Experimental Group #1 (the group which received special instruction relating to the stylistic features of the quintets) to the quintets of Diamond and Sydeman were significantly different when compared with the responses of the Elementary Category of the Control Group and Experimental Group #2. When compared with the responses of the Elementary Category of Experimental Group #3 (the group which did not receive any special instruction but which heard the music prior to the concert), the responses of Experimental Group #1 were significantly different only for the first movement of the Sydeman quintet. In each instance where there was a significant difference, the responses of Experimental Group #1 were more favorable.

However, the difference was much less apparent when the responses to the more traditional quintets of Persichetti and Etler were compared. Only in the responses to the second movement of the Etler quintet were the responses of Experimental Group #1 significantly different from the responses of the other three groups. In this instance the mean response of Experimental Group #1 was less favorable.

The researcher concluded that the data indicated a limited significance in the tendency of elementary school children to respond more favorably to the quintets stressing contemporary styles as a result of special instruction in the stylistic features of the music. However, the evidence supporting such a conclusion was not well defined and further study involving more extensive training relating to stylistic features was necessary before such a conclusion could be considered valid. With regard to the more traditional works, special instruction did not significantly affect the manner in which elementary school children responded to the music.

A comparison of the responses of the Junior High School Category of Experimental Group #1 with the responses of the Junior High School Categories of the other three groups indicated differences of limited significance for two of the quintets, namely, the Diamond and Sydeman quintets. The researcher concluded that the data indicated a limited significance in the tendency of the junior high school pupils to respond less favorable to the quintets stressing contemporary styles as a result of special instruction in the stylistic features of the music. Again the evidence supporting such a conclusion was not well defined and further study involving more extensive training relating to stylistic features was necessary. At the junior high level there was no significant difference in the responses to the music as a result of special training in the stylistic features of the music.

At the senior high school level, the researcher noted that while previous hearings tended to elicit less favorable responses to all four quintets, there was a tendency for specialized instruction in the stylistic features of the music to offset the less favorable responses to a limited degree. However, once again the evidence was not well defined and further study involving a more extensive training relating to the stylistic features of the music was necessary.

In general, the evidence relating the knowledge of the structural and stylistic features of the music to the aesthetic attitudes of the school children was inconclusive.

3. What is the relation of knowledge of the composer's background and the historical background of the music to the aesthetic attitudes of school children?

At the elementary level, the analysis of the responses to the more traditional quintets (Persichetti and Etler) indicated that there was no significant difference in the responses as a result of special instruction relating to biographical and historical backgrounds. However, with regard to the responses to the Diamond and Sydeman quintets, the children in Experimental Group #2 (the group which received special instruction relating to biographical and historical backgrounds) tended to respond in a significantly different manner than did the elementary school children in the other two experimental groups. The mean responses of Experimental Group #2 were less favorable.

The researcher concluded that the knowledge of the composer's background and the historical background of the woodwind quintet had no effect on the aesthetic attitudes of the children when the music was related to traditional styles. On the other hand knowledge of the composer's background and the historical background of the music tended to have a negative effect on the aesthetic attitudes of the children in Experimental Group #2 as indicated by their less favorable responses.

At the junior high school level, the researcher found that knowledge of the composer's background and the historical background of the music had no apparent affect on the manner in which the Junior High School Category of Experimental Group #2 responded to the music.

As was previously discussed in Part II of Chapter V, the researcher determined that the fact that 25 students from the Senior High School Category of Experimental Group #2 were not present at the special concert created an imbalance in the group which served to distort the data collected from Experimental Group #2. As a result the researcher did not attempt to draw any conclusions as to the relation of knowledge of the composer's background and the historical background of the music to the aesthetic attitudes of the students in the Senior High School Category of Experimental Group #2 . The researcher did surmise that, had all the members of the Senior High School Category of Experimental Group #2 been present at the concert, the net effect would have been that knowledge of the composer's background and the historical background of the music would have served to offset the generally less favorable response which occurred as a result of a previous hearing of the music.

4. Does the age-educational level of the children affect these relationships?

The pattern of responses of the pupils, in terms of the age-educational level was significantly different when the mean responses to the Diamond and Sydeman quintets were analyzed. The pattern of mean responses was quite clear. In every group the Elementary School Category had the highest mean response and the Senior High School Category had the lowest mean response.

The distinction was not as clear when the responses to the Persichetti and Etler quintets were analyzed. In every group the Elementary School Category had the highest mean response. However, in general, the mean responses of the Junior High School Category and the Senior High School Category in each group were not significantly different.

The researcher concluded that the age-education level of the children significantly affected the relationship between aesthetic attitudes and those compositions which utilized the more modern stylistic features, namely, serial technique, atonality, pointillism and dissonance. In every case the younger children showed a greater preference for the contemporary style than did the older children. In the case of the more traditional styles the age-educational level significantly affected the relationship between aesthetic attitudes and the compositions which utilized the more traditional sounds only in the youngest group, elementary school children.

5. Is there a significant difference in the aesthetic attitudes of the children as a result of special instruction in the structural and stylistic features of the music, or special instruction relating to the composer's background and the historical background of the music?

In the Elementary Category those children in Experimental Group #1 did tend to respond in a significantly different way from those in Experimental Group #2 to the Diamond and Sydeman quintets. They tended to respond more favorably. However, in their responses to the more traditional music, the Persichetti and Etler quintets, the differences in mean responses were not significant. Therefore, the researcher concluded that special instruction in structural and stylistic features of the music which stressed the newer contemporary styles (serial technique, pointillism, etc.) had a greater effect on the aesthetic attitudes of the elementary school children than did special instruction in biographical and historical backgrounds.

At the junior high school level the evidence was not as clear. While differences in mean responses between the Junior High School Categories in Experimental Groups #1 and #2 did occur in four movements, in each case the significance was limited and the differences in responses did not follow any particular pattern. The researcher concluded that, at the junior high school level, there was no significant result of the special instruction relating to stylistic features of the music or to biographical and historical backgrounds.

As was previously noted, the researcher determined that the data collected from the Senior High School Category ih Experimental Group #2 was distorted as a result of the failure of 25 students to attend the special concert. Therefore any comparison of the responses between the Senior High School Categories in Experimental Groups #1 and #2 would be open to question as to its validity. As a result, no conclusions were drawn as to the affect of the two different types of special instruction at the senior high school level.

6. Other conclusions.

The analysis of the data of Part II of the study revealed other evidence which led to certain conclusions not related specifically to the questions stated at the beginning of the study.

A pattern of responses relating to the tempo of the music was clearly evident in all four groups and each of the three categories within each group. Mean responses to those movements with fast or lively tempi were consistently higher than were the mean responses to the movements with slower tempi. Thus, the conclusion was reached that the tempo of the music had a definite effect on the aesthetic attitudes of the school children regardless of their age-educational level. There was a definite preference for faster and more lively tempi.

At the elementary level the mean responses for each group of children were always positive, indicating a "liking" or a preference for each composition. During the conduct of the study one of the participating teachers had mentioned the fact that his pupils liked everything they heard, regardless of what it was. He had raised the question as to whether or not any significant differences in responses would occur because of the tendency of elementary school children to always respond in a generally favorable manner. The evidence collected did indicate, even though elementary school children did always tend to respond in a favorable manner, that differences in the patterns of response were significant. Children at the elementary level were selective in their aesthetic attitudes. The study also indicated that the aesthetic attitudes of the elementary school children were more pliable, they could be changed or modified more readily as a result of previous hearings and special instruction.

The implications contained herein are quite important. For the results of the study clearly indicated that the elementary level is the place to begin a comprehensive study of the nature of the musical art. If the music of the contemporary American composer is to become an integral part of the American culture, the individuals who form that culture must be able to comprehend the nature and meaning of the music. The elementary grades serve as a logical point at which to begin the serious comprehensive study of the characteristics and features of the musical art. Such a study should not be limited to those characteristics which have become traditional, rather the activities of the avant garde can also be of value in making the young child aware of the nature of his musical culture. Our music culture today is not based solely on major and minor scales, but rather on a variety of tonal and atonal concepts. For example, it is just as important that the elementary school pupil become acquainted with tone rows (serial technique), pointillism, dissonance, and other new techniques of composition as it is that they become aware of the nature of the more traditional tonal patterns.

What is needed is a more comprehensive methodology of music instruction at the elementary school level which would take into account the significant developments in music composition during the Twentieth century, as well as those of the earlier periods of music history.

This need becomes even more evident when the responses of the junior and senior high school students are reviewed. That the aesthetic attitudes of the junior and senior high school students were less pliable was quite evident in the data collected. The tendency for both categories of students to respond in a less favorable manner to the music heard as a result of previous hearings and special instruction strongly suggests their concepts of the nature of the musical art are quite limited. Their aesthetic attitudes reflect a rather limited understanding of the nature of the musical art. The tendency on the part of the junior and senior high school student to respond in a less favorable manner as a result of special instruction and previous hearings suggests that the role of social pressures which tend to help mold the aesthetic attitudes are of considerable importance. How can they really determine what is acceptable if they are not aware of what has been going on creatively in the music world for the past thirty or more years. And, more important, see it in relation to what happened at an earlier period of time.

The development of a broader base of musical understanding becomes paramount if the contemporary American composer is to have an audience for his music. The base of musical understanding which leads to the development of aesthetic attitudes is not a simple set of rather rigid scale and chord patterns propelled by basic rhythm patterns, rather it is a much more dynamic and varied set of structural and stylistic concepts of music composition. It is then this more varied approach to the development of a broader base of musical understanding or comprehension that is needed at the elementary school level of music instruction. The aesthetic attitudes of elementary school children are positive and plastic. They can be readily expanded at the time when the mind is most willing and flexible. By the time the pupil has reached the junior high school his aesthetic attitudes have already become somewhat rigid. Negative reactions become more apparent. He is less willing to accept a change in the base to which his aesthetic attitudes are attached.

This then, is the significance of the fact that the senior high school student tended to respond in a less favorable manner when he was exposed to the music a second time. The special instruction and previous hearing had suggested that the music he was hearing was acceptable, while his concepts of musical understanding which provided the basis for his aesthetic attitudes were not broad enough to permit him to agree. So he tended to reject the idea that the music being performed was acceptable. Two or three hours of special instruction for the junior and senior high school student were not enough to broaden the base of musical understanding. However, for the more flexible elementary school child, even two or three hours of special instruction and listening to a style of music which was significantly different was enough to begin to expand the base of musical understanding.

Implications for the Contemporary American Composer.

In the discussion of the basic problem at the beginning of the study the researcher pointed out that a paradox exists with contemporary American music. While the American composer has made significant strides in creative expression, is more concerned about the theoretical bases of his work, and is receiving more support for his endeavors, there exists today a greater gap between the composer and his audience than has ever existed. This study proposed to study this problem in a preliminary way in an attempt to determine the nature of the existing gap between the composer and his audience.

If one single idea is to be selected from the findings of the study, the researcher can quite readily determine that a lack of understanding of what the composer is doing is an issue of paramount importance. Mere familiarity with the composer and his music does not lead to an acceptance of the composer's music. Aesthetic attitudes are developed as a result of the nature and extent of the auditor's understanding of the musical art. Therefore, if the auditor or listener is to accept the creative efforts of the contemporary American composer, he must understand what the composer is doing. This does not mean that understanding or comprehension will automatically result in approval and acceptance. But it does suggest that understanding will aid in the ultimate approval and acceptance of the efforts of the composer by his audience.

The fact that responses in terms of age and educational attainment did not reveal significant differences in the manner in which the listener responded to the music suggests that maturity and formal education do not necessarily lead to acceptance of new music styles. That familiarity with a composition or even a sense of familiarity does not affect the aesthetic attitudes of the listener to any significant degree was also evident. However, the significant difference in the responses of the musicians, when compared with the responses of other professionals, did imply that a broader understanding of what the composer was conveying in his composition was important.

The fact that formal music training was a significant factor in the relationship between aesthetic attitudes and the stylistic features of the music gives further weight to the suggestion that a broader understanding of the music is an essential factor in the development of an aesthetic attitude.

At every concert in Part I of the study the listeners were able to fairly readily identify the more important stylistic characteristics of the music. It was also interesting to note that there tended to be considerable agreement among the listeners as to which characteristics were more important when the responses to the music were most favorable.

The implication of the nature of the role of musical understanding was evident in the responses of the untrained listener. He tended to rely more heavily on mood characteristics to indicate what he felt was most significant in the music. The degree to which he tended to respond more favorably appeared to relate somewhat to the extent to which he agreed with other untrained listeners as to which mood characteristic was most important. When responses to stylistic characteristics were more scattered the untrained listener tended to respond in a less favorable manner. Again the implication that a lack of understanding led to a lack of agreement and a less favorable response was evident. The reactions of the untrained listener are quite important for the great majority of individuals who make up the audience at a concert have little or no formal music training.

To assume that because the untrained listener has developed an understanding of more traditional styles, he will also be able to understand newer music styles and techniques when he hears them, is dangerous. For this does not appear to be the case. Nor does a formal lecture or statement setting forth the composer's intent seem to lead to an immediate understanding. Prior to the first concert Ben Johnston gave a lecture in which he discussed his music which was to be performed at the concert. His explanation of the work did not lead to a favorable attitude response on the part of the audience. The untrained listener still tended to respond in a negative way, for he was unable to relate the spoken word to the sounds he heard.

At this point the researcher again stresses that there was no evaluation of the musical merit of the compositions performed built into the study. The basic assumption was inherent from the beginning of the study that the works selected for performance had been selected because they had musical worth. Had this not been the case there would have been little justification for the Exposition.

If the contemporary American composer wishes to have his music accepted he must then take steps to ascertain that his audience, especially those with little or no formal music training, have a basic understanding of what he is doing. For works employing newer styles and techniques this may even mean explaining in a rather minute detail, relating the spoken or written word to the musical sound, specifically what the characteristics of his music are and how he is using them. For the newer techniques and styles this must be a continuing process. This was not the case for the Eighteenth or Nineteenth century composer because his "newer" techniques could still quite readily be related to the accepted traditional sounds. Hence special attention to specifics was not vital to the acceptance of the music by the listener. However, the listener in the 1960's does not have the breadth of musical understanding which enables him to relate contemporary styles and techniques to the older and more traditional sounds which were present in the bulk of his past musical experiences. When his base of musical understanding is broadened his aesthetic attitudes will tend to change.

The elementary school children in Part II of the study were more flexible and special instruction and previous hearings seemed to significantly affect their aesthetic attitudes even though the special instruction was limited. However, even by the time the pupil has reached the junior high school the flexibility once apparent has diminished considerably. This does suggest that age and formal education can have an effect, but the effect is of a minor significance and of no real importance if the process of maturity and formal education are not accompanied by the cultivation of a broader concept of musical understanding.

The role of musical understanding was evident in the responses to the music which, although employing newer styles and techniques, related them to more traditional sounds. Such compositions tended to be received more favorably by the auditors. Special effects also served a useful purpose in terms of furthering acceptance of a music composition although the more highly trained musician tended to react less favorably to the use of special effects.

The auditor-composer relationship is also of apparent value in furthering the acceptance of a composer's works. To this end the social relationship between the composer and his audience is important. (The idea of social relationship is used here in its broader sense, that of the listener being able to identify himself with the composer to some degree.) The acceptance of the composer by the listener as a member of the same society in which the listener lives then serves as another means furthering the music of the composer.

The researcher does not claim that the study has proved conclusively that a broader understanding of the nature of the musical art will bring about complete acceptance of a composer's work. The acceptance of a composer's music involves many factors which appear to be highly complex. However, the study has provided significant evidence which supports the idea that a broader base of musical understanding is paramount to the development of aesthetic attitudes which can lead to the acceptance of new music which has musical merit.

PRECEDING PAGE BLANK-NOT FILMED

APPENDICES

Appendix A

SURVEY OF ATTITUDES TOWARD CONTEMPORARY AMERICAN MUSIC

PERSONAL INFORMATION

OCCUPATION

(Place an "X" beside the category which best describes your occupation. Homemakers, in addition to checking this category, are to also check the category of their spouse.)

Professional
college professor ____
elementary or high school teacher . ____
musician ____
other ____
Proprietor, Manager ____
Dealer ____
Clerk, office worker ____
Farmer ____
Foremen, skilled labor ____
semi-skilled labor ____
unskilled labor ____
college student ____
homemaker ____

Also indicate whether or not you are actively engaged in your occupation___ or retired___.

AGE OF AUDITOR

(Check the age group to which you belong)

21 or under ____
22 - 25 ____
26 - 35 ____
36 - 45 ____
46 - 55 ____
56 - 65 ____
66 or over ____

SUMMARY OF MUSIC TRAINING

Number of years of private lessons on piano_____; voice_____; other instrument (indicate instrument and number of years)____________________

Number of years of class lessons on piano_____; voice_____; other instrument (indicate instrument and number of years)____________________

Number of years of band, orchestra participation in high school, college, community or professional groups.____

Number of years of chorus participation in high school, college, community, professional or church groups.______

Number of hours of college credit in music.______________

Check the musical instruments in your home: Piano_____; AM radio_____; FM radio_____; Phonograph (hi-fi or stereo)_____; other instruments (indicate instruments and number)______
____

Number of persons in your family, exclusive of you, who play the piano _____; other instruments (indicate instruments and number who play them)____________________
____

Do you play and sing together in your home?____________________

EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT

Completed the ninth grade or less____
Attended high school
but did not graduate____
High School graduate _____
Attended college
but did not graduate____
College graduate
(baccalaureate degree)____
Received Master's degree _____
Received Doctor's degree _____

PERSONAL PREFERENCE REACTION

Please refer to program card to identify musical compositions.

(Circle the number of the statement which best describes your reaction to each composition.)

Like very much (strong preference)	+2	+2	+2	+2	+2	+2
Like (prefer)	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1
Undecided, do not know, no opinion	0	0	0	0	0	0
Dislike (lack of preference)	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1
Dislike very much (strong lack of preference)	-2	-2	-2	-2	-2	-2

What characteristics do you notice in the music? (Indicate your first choice with "1"; second choice with "2"; third choice with "3", etc.)	1	2	3	4	5	6
Spiritual, serious, inspiring						
Heavy, gloomy, pathetic						
Sentimental, tender, pleading						
Quiet, lyrical, satisfying, calm						
Humorous, light, graceful						
Bright, cheerful, gay						
Dramatic, agitated, exciting, triumphant						
Majestic, martial, vigorous						
Irregular melodic contour, disjointed (angular)						
Lyric melody						
Could not hear a melody						
Block chordal structure						
Changing tonality						
Dissonant sounds						
Consonant sounds						
Masses or blocks of sounds						
Lack of recognizable structure						
Orderliness of structure						
Disjointed series of sounds (pointillistic)						
Sounds like atonal music						
Interweaving of melodies (contrapuntal)						
Chordal accompaniment of a single melody						
Extreme pitch ranges (high-low) of the music						
Ornamentation of melodies						
Cluttered texture, busy music						
Simple texture						
Strange orchestral effects						
Wind instrument color						
String instrument color						
Voice/choral color						
Dynamic contrast of music						
Percussion color						
Percussive rhythms						
Repetitive rhythms						
Lack of strong rhythmic feeling						
Irregular rhythms						
Tempo or speed of the music						

FAMILIARITY	1	2	3	4	5	6
The composition sounds familiar, as though I have heard it before.	A	A	A	A	A	A
I am not sure whether or not I have heard the work before.	B	B	B	B	B	B
The composition is unfamiliar. I have never heard it before.	C	C	C	C	C	C

APPENDIX B

Lesson Plan Materials - Experimental Group #1

Elementary School Level

Lesson Plan No. 1: Pastoral - Vincent Persichetti
Quintet No. 2 - Alvin Etler

I. Objectives:

- A. General Objectives:
  - 1. To develop an appreciation for contemporary music.
  - 2. To assist in an investigation into the discriminating abilities and attitudes of school-age youngsters.
- B. Specific Objectives:
  - 1. To point out the essential stylistic traits of four contemporary woodwind quintets.
  - 2. To assist the youngsters in holding these stylistic differences in their minds as they hear the music on the day of the concert.

II. Materials:

- A. Tape recorder and playback speakers
- B. Tape of recorded music
- C. Chalkboard
- D. Staffliner
- E. Scores of compositions for the teacher

III. Activities:

- A. Primarily teacher centered, using the lecture-demonstration method.
- B. Student involvement, however, will be fostered whenever possible through:
  - 1. Singing of themes.
  - 2. Tapping of rhythms.

IV. Step-by-Step Procedure:

Introductory remarks about the concert we shall hear, and that we are going to have an opportunity to listen to the music before we go. Mention only that a woodwind quintet from the symphony orchestra will play, that the instruments are flute, oboe, clarinet, french horn and bassoon. We shall hear four compositions written in our time (use term contemporary where possible) each sounding quite different from the other.

1. The first quintet is called Pastoral by Vincent Persichetti. What kind of piece of music do you expect to hear? (Develop ideas of country-fields, hills, flocks, shepherds, etc.)

(Put three themes on board beforehand). As we hear the music, listen for these melodies. (Point to each as it occurs.) Does the flute sound like a shepherd's pipe at the beginning?

(After the first hearing, ask questions about the "feeling" of the music. Draw out that it begins quietly and simply, gets more "busy" (more instruments at once), changes meter from three to two (for 4th grade, it counts differently), comes to a climax, then gets quiet again at the end.

Play again, reminding children to listen for repetitions of melodies 1 and 2, change of meter for melody 3 which is almost a dance, return of melody 1).

2. The second composition does not have a title which tells us what to expect a particular type of music. It is called simply Quintet No. 2 by Alvin Etler, and is in four parts or movements. What type composition have we heard which is divided into movements? - Symphonies whose parts often are fast, slow, medium (minuet or scherzo), and fast.

(Put names of movements on board - Andante con moto, Allegro commodo, Adagio, Vivace. Listen to tape, discover that the music is extremely rhythmic all the way through.

Talk about the instruments entering one at a time, called contrapuntal entrances (or written in counterpoint), then all together on the same melody, called unison. Put these terms on the board.

Play again commenting or pointing to various terms on the board as they listen).

Lesson Plan No. 2: Quintet - David Diamond
Quintet No. 2 - William Sydeman

(Objectives, materials, activities, and related classroom procedure for this lesson will be the same as for Lesson No. 1.)

IV. Step-by-Step Procedure:

Today we shall hear two more compositions which will be on our woodwind quintet concert. These may sound quite different to you from those we listened to yesterday.

1. The first is Quintet in three movements by David Diamond. (Put names of movements on board - Andante grazioso, Theme and variations, Allegro fugato - and talk briefly about their meaning.)

(Listen to a short portion of the beginning of the second movement, then stop). Could you find "do"? Can you sing the scale? No, because this music doesn't use any scale that we know. It is built on what we call a 12-tone row. On the piano, let us count up all the tones from c to c. There are twelve. A row uses all 12 but in any order which the composer chooses. (If resonator bells are available, use Beth Crook's method). In addition to the original arrangement of the row, it may be turned upside down or inverted, and backward or retrograde. (In sixth grade, perhaps the others, put actual row used by Diamond on the board).

(Play part of composition again) What kind of melody? Wide skips, jumps high, jumps low. What kind of harmony? Not the chords we have been learning, but harsh sounds called dissonances. Can you count as you listen? It would be very difficult because it changes constantly, is complicated by many rests, syncopation, etc. The whole composition is extreme in every way, sounds disconnected, jumps from one instrument to another. This type of writing is called pointillism (Comment on Seurat's painting "La Grande jette" in which many dots of paint form the picture).

(Play entire second movement).

2. Our last composition is Quintet No. 2 by William Sydeman. We shall hear only the first two short movements. As in Diamond's quintet, we shall have difficulty finding "do". We are so used to our songs being in particular keys that it sounds very strange when there seems to be no key, no home tone at all. Such music is called atonal or without key.

Listen to a sample. There was no discernable key. What else seemed strange? The lack of metric feeling. The counting changes so frequently and is so complicated that it is almost impossible to discover the meter. Can you hear any places where there is pointillism in this composition? (Play both movements straight through).

Lesson Plan Materials - Experimental Group #1

Junior High School Level

Lesson Plan No. 1: Pastoral - Vincent Persichetti
Quintet No. 2 - William Sydeman

I. Objectives:

A. General Objectives:
   1. To develop an appreciation for contemporary music.
   2. To assist in an investigation into the discriminating abilities and attitudes of school-age youngsters.

B. Specific Objectives:
   1. To point out the essential stylistic traits of four contemporary woodwind quintets.
   2. To assist the youngsters in holding these stylistic differences in their minds as they "enjoy" the music on the day of the concert.

II. Materials:

A. Tape recorder and playback speakers
B. Tape of recorded music
C. Chalkboard
D. Staffliner
E. Scores of compositions for the teacher

III. Activities:

A. Primarily teacher centered, using the lecture-demonstration method.
B. Student involvement, however, will be fostered whenever possible through:
   1. Singing of themes.
   2. Tapping of rhythms.

IV. Step-by-Step Procedure:

Teacher:

Today we will examine two contemporary compositions for woodwind quintet. "Contemporary" means "at the same time." The word is used in this instance to refer to music written within the past few years. "Contemporary" music may sound familiar or it may sound entirely new and strange.

One of the compositions you will hear today will sound not too different from what Schubert or Brahms might have written. The other composition will be quite different and distinct from anything you would usually call music.

How can it be called music, and yet not sound like music to us? Very easily. We must expand our definition of music to include not only pretty melodies and regular rhythms, but to include all systematically organized combinations of sound. If we take time to study the system, we may find the sounds to be quite interesting.

A basketball game, for example, to anyone completely unfamiliar with the purpose and rules of the game, must look like a strange affair, indeed. Great big men poking a little ball through a wire hoop, and everyone all excited every time it happens. But to anyone who knows the game, there is great meaning in all that running and jumping and scrambling for the ball. So it is with music. If we are willing to learn the rules of the game, we can often find excitement and great meaning in all that tooting and hooting and clashing of sounds.

Now suppose someone changed the rule of basketball. Suppose the fans and players got tired of the same old game, and suppose they decided--and did not tell you about it--that the central purpose of the game was no longer to put the ball directly through the hoop, but, rather, the central purpose was to bounce the basketball off two walls before putting it through the hoop. You would attend a basketball game and probably be greatly confused by the wild actions of the players. You might even throw your hands up in disgust and say, "That's not basketball! What ever happened to the good old game we used to watch?"

Again, so it is with music. Someone has changed the rules, and, probably you have not been informed of the new game. Our musical melodies and harmonies do not go "directly through the hoop," anymore. Our contemporary melodies and harmonies may even seem to bounce off two walls before getting to the hoop.

Or, another way of thinking about the issue, would be to think of regular traditional music as a standard automobile sedan. Big, shiny, smooth, very comfortable. Contemporary music is more like a hot-rod, though. Designed for a specific intense purpose. Not comfortable or beautiful in the usual sense of the term, but terribly "correct" for the function at hand.

Our first composition, Vincent Persichetti's *Pastoral*, is not too far removed from traditional music. Let us hear one of the first melodies to appear in the music.

(Teacher plays the theme on the piano).

(Students sing the theme).

This melody appears at various times during the first half of the composition. The second half of the composition is a little more rhythmic. The theme goes like this:

(Teacher plays, students sing, again).

The first melody comes back again at the very end of the composition. If we used signs for sections, we might have Ø for the first section and * for the second section. Or we might call the first section "A" and the second section "B". Thus the form of the composition would be designated as AB form, or two-part form, generally called "binary form." The fact that a little bit of the first melody returns at the very end of the piece does not really change the overall construction. Musicians sometimes call such a form "rounded" or "closed" binary form to acknowledge the return of the fragment of the first melody.

Now that we know the two basic themes and the general form, let us hear the composition from beginning to end. Teacher plays Persichetti's *Pastoral* (5:25).

Our next composition, William Sydeman's *Quintet No. 2*, has no clearly defined melodies. The composer does not try to present a singable melody in the old standard way, but, rather, he tries to keep our interest with only fragments of themes which drive forward in a rather unpredictable manner. This is a much more difficult task for the composer than to write a straightforward melody. It is also much more difficult for the listener to perceive.

Because the melodic fragments do not seem to center around one special tone, as most melodies do in the music we know--i.e. in "tonal" music--music which follows a predictable pattern and ends on "do" or "home plate"--because Sydeman's music does not do this, it is called "atonal" music: music not centered around a special tone.

Now as soon as we destroy "home plate," we have lost our point of reference for the other bases in the field, and nearly any distribution of foul lines and base lines would be theoretically possible. So it is with music. As soon as we destroy the "home" tone, we are free to combine any odd assortment of tones. These collections of tones will not be "chords," in the usual sense of the word, and therefore they are not called chords, but rather, they are called "tone clusters."

The "tone clusters" may be immediately pleasing or immediately objectionable. The sounds may be harsh and "dissonant." Dissonant sounds, though, are a little like olives: seemingly very bitter at first, but then after a while, you may find that you rather enjoy the bitterness.

Sydeman has also broken the monotony of a regular beat. He does not want us to tap our toe or to dance to the music. He wants all our attention on the interplay of notes among the instruments. Do not try to find a danceable beat, but just listen to the musical energy Sydeman has created by the sounds he gives to the instruments.

In summary, do not try to find the old fashioned kind of melodies, chords, and rhythms in this music; they are not there. This music is not like the standard two-door sedan: fenders shiny and in the right place, everything running smoothly and in a soft, well-cushioned manner. This music is more like a snazzy hot-rod, stripped down to bare essentials: with maybe only a thin strip of sheet metal for a fender, with energy bursting from a souped-up engine, with tires screeching and digging into the speedway.

Teacher then plays Sydeman's Quintet No. 2, First Movement (4:00), Second Movement (2:02).

Lesson Plan No. 2: Quintet No. 2 - Alvin Etler
Quintet - David Diamond

(Objectives, materials, activities, and related classroom procedure for this lesson will be the same as for Lesson No. 1.)

IV. Step-by-Step Procedure:

Yesterday we heard two contemporary compositions for woodwind quintet. Today we will hear two more.

Alvin Etler's Quintet No. 2 is in four separate sections. Each section is called a "movement." Mozart, Haydn, and others wrote four-movement works in this order: fast, slow, medium, fast. Etler reverses the inner two movements, thus giving us fast, medium, slow and fast tempos for the four movement composition.

As with Persichetti's Pastoral, we will be able to find a few melodies here, not quite as easily singable as Persichetti's melodies, but still melodies. But the most compelling musical ingredient in the composition is the steady rhythm. Etler wants us to feel the steady drive of the rhythmic pulses. Sydeman did not. Etler's rhythm carries us along through several areas of sound, and sound is the second most important musical factor.

Etler takes special opportunity to mix the sounds of the instruments by having them play the same notes "in unison," i.e. on the very same notes, and "in octaves," i.e. eight notes separated from each other. The result is a new sound, not really a clarinet, not really an oboe, but a pleasant mixture of both. This technique allows for many times the basic five tone qualities of the quintet.

A third item of interest is Etler's special kind of "home plate." Etler's melodies and chords are not exactly old fashioned, but they are surely not as new as the one by Sydeman. Etler may seem to step out of line for a while, but he will always come back to the center of the tonal system of his choice before the movement ends.

Listen, now, for the three items of special interest: the regular satisfaction of steady rhythm, the clever combinations of instrumental sounds, and the wandering away from and returning to a basic "home plate" key center.

Teacher plays Etler's Quintet No. 2, First Movement (3:04), Second Movement (3:50), Third Movement (3:00), and Fourth Movement (4:25).

Teacher:
Our final composition, David Diamond's Quintet, was composed in a system known as "serialism." Serial music is composed by setting up a series of tones in a row. The composer chooses from all the notes until he has used all twelve tones in his row. The music is, thus, sometimes called "twelve-tone" music or dodecaphonic music.

The twelve tones may be used in almost any manner: odd numbers forming chords, even numbers forming melodies, and so on. The tone row can be used backwards, i.e. in "retrograde motion"; upside down, i.e. "inverted"; moved to another area, i.e. "transposed." The possibilities for manipulating the twelve separate tones in the series are really unlimited. Diamond has set up the following tone row:

(Teacher plays tone row on the piano).

Some composers are very strict in observing certain rules about the tone row. Diamond is not. He takes great freedom with the row. The theme of his second movement is, for example, a very liberal distortion of the basic row.

The second movement is entitled "Theme and Variations," meaning just what the title suggests--a basic melody treated and adjusted in different ways to give variety to the overall movement. Diamond's variations are merely a quite free use of the basic theme in different melodic, rhythmic, and harmonic settings.

It is important to note that Diamond returns to the original theme in his last variation. This brings order to the entire operation and helps us, as listeners, to re-establish our first associations.

This music, again, like the music of Sydeman, is not for old fashioned folks. This is modern, hot-rod styled music. And like a hot-rod, it may not be beautiful in the usual sense of the term to most people, but it may be especially beautiful to those who know something of the skill and intelligence that went into the construction of the final product.

Teacher plays David Diamond's Quintet, Second Movement (8:35).

Lesson Plan Materials - Experimental Group #1

Senior High School Level

Stylistic Aspects of Four Selected Woodwind Quintets

I. Objectives:

General:

1. To develop an appreciation for contemporary music.
2. To assist in a research project designed to measure the discriminating powers of secondary school youth.

Specific:

1. To point out the differences between compositions based on stylistic traits.
2. To assist the student in holding these differences in their minds as they hear the concert.

II. Materials:

1. Tape recorder and playback speakers
2. Tape of recorded music
3. Chalkboard
4. Staffliner
5. Scores of compositions for the teacher

III. Activities:

1. Primarily teacher centered, using the lecture-demonstration method.
2. Student involvement, however, will be fostered whenever possible. For example, students may be asked to sing a theme written on the chalkboard and/or tap the rhythm of a specific phrase.

IV. Content and Procedures:

Today and tomorrow (or the subsequent meeting period), we will be hearing four woodwind quintets, written by contemporary American composers. As many of you know, the Woodwind Quintet is comprised of five instruments, namely -- Flute, Clarinet, Oboe, Bassoon, and French Horn.

While you hear this music, you will realize that the Quintets sound different, that is, each has its own unique characteristics. You will also realize that music can be written using a variety of compositional techniques and devices. The thing to listen for is the manner in which the sounds are organized. Each composition has meaning to the listener if he understands what the composer is saying and the manner or style in which it is said. All the compositions you will hear are written in legitimate styles. All have been used until they have become traditional, that is, they have become accepted and a strain of composers have used this style.

1. The first composition you will hear is Pastoral by Vincent Persichetti. (Write all titles on chalkboard).

What might you expect when you see this title? (Something quiet and subdued?) Definition of pastoral: "Any work dealing or representing country life."

The music is a warm, pleasant, summary piece. It is very melodic with consonant harmonies (i.e. lacking in dissonance), and it contains interesting rhythmic activity.

The form, or over-all architectural structure, of the music is binary or two-part form (AB Coda).

In the first part you will hear two themes: (Write both themes on the chalkboard and then play on the piano).

In the second part, the music is slightly reminiscent of a "barn dance." The first theme you will hear in this section is: (Write on chalkboard and play on piano).

Listen for the short coda, or "tag" in the final measures of the music. It is slightly reminiscent of the first theme in Part I.

As we listen to the music now, note that it begins rather quietly, gradually gathers momentum and rhythmic activity, rises to a climax, and then subsides at the conclusion.

Play Recording (first time).

As you listened to the music, did you note that the texture (define word, if necessary) was fairly light and open, with only occasional use of the full group? (Two predominate textures are (1) the melody occurring over sustained chords, and (2) a very active rhythmic line in one instrument) (or doubled). As we hear the music again, listen for this lightness of texture. Also note that the chord spacings are often very wide-spread (Illustrate).

Play Recording (second time).

2. The next composition we will hear is Quintet No. 2 by William Sydeman. The music is written in four movements, of which we will hear the first two. You may wonder why a composer organizes his music into movements! It is because he wants to separate his ideas -- ideas which are related, but he doesn't want to mix them up indiscriminately. The time-honored tradition was for composers to vary the tempi between each of the four movements. That is, Fast, Slow, Medium, and Fast. Sydeman has varied this practice. While his first movement is fast (Allegro,♩=120) his second movement is even somewhat faster (Allegro,♩=126).

Formally, the two movements are as follows:

I -- Slow introduction -- faster middle section -- slow ending.

II - Scherzo: much rhythmic activity, fast throughout.

This music will sound entirely different to you than the Pastoral by Persichetti. As you listen to the music, note the composer's use of "Pointillism" (compare to pointillism in painting. Show class Seurat's "Afternoon in the Park." Call attention to small brush strokes).

From the technical standpoint, the music is most difficult to play. One of the performers has said "that they seldom play it precisely the same way!" This statement gives verification to the music's difficulty.

As you listen, note that the melody and rhythm are choppy and fragmentary and that the music lacks the smooth thematic development of music we are accustomed to hearing. Tempo is an important factor in the music and is almost constantly in the process of changing. Tempo changes are very frequent -- sometimes they are very slight and subtle and, other times, they are extreme. The rhythmic patterns are extremely irregular, with much syncopation and polyrhythm. There is hardly any feeling of meter, because no rhythm is regular or persistent enough to suggest one.

The music is atonal, that is, it lacks any discernable tonal center. The sonorities are highly dissonant. A typical harmonic texture is one that consists of sustained chords with one voice changing at a time. The composer is also fond of passages containing chords formed by instruments entering one by one, then slowly dissolving until only one instrument is left.

In summary, the music contains extreme contrasts or differences in tempo (rate of speed), dynamics (loud to soft) and in range.

3. The first composition you will hear today is a portion of Quintet by David Diamond. Its total length is about 16-17 minutes. The music is written in three movements, of which the second movement takes about half the total time. The movements are:

I. Andante grazioso, followed by an Allegro with frequent slight tempo modifications.

II. Theme and Variations -- a very slow, very short theme followed by 14 brief variations; a "scherzino" interlude separates variations 7 and 8.

III. Allegro fugato -- highly contrapuntal.

The most important fact about this music is its use of serialism. In this method, the twelve tones of the chromatic scale are arranged by the composer in a particular order. No tone is to be repeated until all the others have been used thus assuring the complete equality of all twelve tones. This is in marked contrast to the major-minor tonal system. The row or set serves as a unifying factor in the music. After the basic set has been introduced then it may be repeated through a variety of means. It may be inverted, that is, turned upside down; it may be written backwards (retrograde), or inverted and written backwards (a retrograde of the inversion). The tone row is a type of variation technique in which great variety is achieved with only a minimum of material.

As you listen to the music, note that the melody is very angular. It has an extremely wide range, many wide leaps, and passes frequently from one instrument to another.

The harmony features very dissonant sonorities. Actually there is hardly any harmonic dimension to the piece and very little use of chords. Contrapuntal textures predominate, and chordal sections usually move so quickly that the ear does not have time to settle on any vertical sonorities.

There is an extremely varied and complex use of rhythm -- irregular rhythmic patterns, much syncopation, short rests and fermatas, sudden tempo modifications, non-metrical rhythms, changing meters, poly-rhythmical effects, etc. The rhythm is most regular in the middle movement. The total effect is one of discontinuity and pointillism. Extreme contrasts of dynamics appear frequently, and dynamic extremes are exploited.

The central core of the work is the second movement -- by far the most interesting. This is the movement we will listen to. Its form is theme and variations. The theme is only five bars long and is entirely melodic.

The theme is a distortion of the original row and is broken into three parts: specifically (A) a distortion of notes 11, 10, 9 and 8 in retrograde, (B) the minor second interval, notes 7 and 8, and (C) a "straightening out" of notes 7, 6, 5, and 4 in retrograde.

The variation process here is simply a free use of these motives in different rhythmic, melodic and contrapuntal contexts. Each variation, it will be noted, changes tempo slightly. It is also interesting to note that in the final variation the tones appear in the form of the original row. Diamond is "putting his house in order."

As you listen to the music, note the extreme contrasts in all the aspects of the music, contrasts in dynamics, range, and tempo.

(4) The last composition in our lesson that you will hear is the Quintet No. 2 by Alvin Etler. The work is in four movements and is about 16 minutes in length.

Rhythm is the most outstanding element of this music. Three of the four movements have considerable rhythmic activity and the tempi are predominantly brisk. These three movements are in simple duple meter or tempo. Regular, repetitive rhythmic patterns are featured, "motor" rhythm, some syncopation, percussive rhythms.

The melody is regular, of moderate range, and quite diatonic. The sonorities are only mildly dissonant with frequent triads, seventh chords, and quartal chords. The texture is predominantly contrapuntal. There is a lot of melodic doubling -- unisons and octaves. Etler has quite an ear for effective combinations of instruments.

The texture is rather light -- when there is imitation, no more than three parts are usually involved. This is not "busy" music in the sense of a lot going on. Etler uses the quintet medium very skillfully. This quintet, more than the other three, exploits the colors of the medium. The Diamond and Sydeman quintets are so complicated musically that the ear is not able to concentrate on the purely sonorous aspect of the music; this work is simpler and thus easier to perceive.

Now, as we hear the music, listen for (1) the rhythm with its strong motoric drive, (2) the clear, unmuddled tonality, and (3) the composer's skillful use of the woodwind quintet medium and the interesting effects he achieves with various combinations of instruments.

APPENDIX C

Lesson Plan Materials - Experimental Group #2

Historical and Biographical Sketches Woodwind Quintet Concert

The materials herein are not designed specifically for any grade level. Rather the information to be presented to each class in Experimental Group #2 is provided and the specific manner of presenting it is left to the discretion of each teacher. As you will notice, most of the information is rather general in character, with the purpose being that of providing general background information to set the stage for the concert, instead of becoming involved in a detailed study of the woodwind quintet and the composers involved.

I. THE SETTING

The class has been selected, along with other classes throughout the Cincinnati School District, to hear a special concert being presented by the College-Conservatory of Music Woodwind Quintet at Wilson Auditorium on the University of Cincinnati Campus, Friday, November 12, 1965 at approximately 1:00 P.M. The music you will hear on the concert will be new music to you, and at the concert you will be asked to indicate whether or not you like the different works that you will hear.

To give you an idea of the music which will be presented on the concert, as well as the instruments in a woodwind quintet, we will spend some time reviewing the early history of the woodwind quintet and some information about the composers whose works you will hear on the concert. I will also play a tape recording of the music.

II. THE WOODWIND QUINTET

A. . Instrumentation

The woodwind quintet has five musicians who play the following instruments - flute, oboe, B-flat soprano clarinet, French horn and bassoon. The members of the

College-Conservatory of Music Woodwind Quintet are the first chair or principal performers on these instruments in the Cincinnati Symphony Orchestra. Each of the men is an outstanding artist on his instrument.

B. Origins of the Woodwind Quintet

Actually the instrumentation of the woodwind quintet is somewhat unique, and the selection of these instruments to make up a woodwind quintet happened because of the circumstances surrounding the development of orchestras and bands in the eighteenth century.

The idea of writing for four or five woodwind instruments alone did not really take root until about the middle of the eighteenth century. By this time each of the instruments (namely, the flute, clarinet, oboe, bassoon and French horn) had been invented and improved to the point that they were included as basic instruments in the bands and orchestras of the time.

For example, oboes and bassoons, along with French horns were the principle instruments of the mid-eighteenth century bands. Orchestras of the time generally contained one or two flutes, one or two oboes, two french horns, two bassoons and slightly later, one or two clarinets. The French horn was the only brass instrument regularly used in the symphony orchestra at that time.

There arose a need for chamber music works to be played by the small groups of woodwind musicians who were members of the orchestras. So composers began to write for those performers. The earliest music was written so that either one or two performers could play each part. Thus you might find either five or ten musicians playing the composition. In fact, some composers actually wrote compositions which utilized pairs of instruments. For example, Mozart wrote a number of beautiful Serenades for ten instruments, utilizing pairs of instruments of the woodwind quintet.

However, most composers began to concentrate on works written for performances by single performers in a group. And since the flute, oboe, clarinet, bassoon and French horn were the principle instruments available, it was only natural that they wrote for this combination.

Once composers got in the habit of writing for this combination it became traditional to use this specific instrumentation in writing for the woodwind quintet. Hence during the remainder of the eighteenth century, throughout the nineteenth century and into the twentieth century, although other instruments were developed and included in the orchestras and bands, the instruments which make up the traditional woodwind quintet have not changed.

It is important to note that the grouping was established because those were the instruments readily available, and not because of any particular desire to hear the color combination possible in this grouping.

C. The Woodwind Quintet in the Twentieth Century

Composers in the twentieth century, when writing for the Woodwind Quintet, take into careful consideration the particular tone color of each instrument and try to write so that each instrument stands out because of its special color characteristics.

You will notice that each instrument tends to stand out and is readily recognized for its different timbre or tone color, as you listen to the woodwind quintet, both on the tape and at the actual performance.

III. THE COMPOSERS

A. General

You will hear woodwind quintets written by four different contemporary American composers. The oldest of the composers has passed his 52nd birthday, two of the composers just reached their fiftieth birthday this year, and the fourth composer belongs to a younger generation.

B. Vincent Persichetti

The composer whose music you will hear first is Vincent Persichetti. Persichetti was born in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania on June 6, 1915. He received his early schooling in Philadelphia, and continued his extensive musical training in the same city. He first achieved recignition as a composer with a Piano Concerto written in 1940 and his First Symphony, composed in 1941. In 1942 he became Head of the Composition Department at the Philadelphia Conservatory of Music, adding the role of master teacher to that of composer. In 1948 he took on the additional responsibility as a teacher of composition and music literature and theory at the Julliard School of Music in New York City. While teaching he has continued to compose many excellent musical works for instrumental and choral groups. He is probably best known for his very fine works for wind instruments, which include a number of Serenades for various combinations of instruments, as well as A Symphony for Band. His woodwind quintet entitled Pastoral, was written in 1951 and has become a very popular work in this medium.

The Pastoral is in one movement.

C. William Sydeman

The youngest composer to be represented on the woodwind quintet concert is William Sydeman. A native of New York City, he was born in 1928, and as might be expected received virtually all of his musical training in New York City. He studied composition at Mannes College of Music in New York City, receiving a Bachelor of Science degree in Composition. He then studied composition at the Hartt College of Music in Hartford, Conn., receiving a Master of Music degree in Composition at the completion of his studies. He is presently an Instructor in Composition at the Mannes College of Music in New York City.

He has also studied privately with the famous American composer Roger Sessions, and credits Sessions as exerting the greatest influence upon his compositional style.

At the age of 36, he has received considerable acclaim as one of America's most promising young composers. Most of his compositions to date have been for chamber groups and soloists with piano accompaniments. He has also written a number of excellent works for piano.

His acceptance as one of America's leading young composers is verified by the fact that he has been commissioned by the Boston Symphony Orchestra to write a work in honor of the late President Kennedy in November, 1966.

His works are heard regularly at chamber and orchestral concerts in New York City.

His Quintet No. 2 for woodwind quintet was composed in 1959 and has been performed by a number of the leading woodwind quintets throughout the country. It is quite difficult to perform, challenging the virtuosity of any quintet who performs it. You will hear the first two movements at the concert.

D. Alvin Etler

Alvin Etler is the only midwestern composer who is represented on the program we will hear. He was born in the little rural community of Battle Creek, Iowa, near the Illinois border, on February 6, 1913. He began his study of music in his home town. Later his family moved to Urbana, Illinois, and by the time he started high school there, he was already experienced in playing several instruments. He settled on the oboe and played that instrument in a theater orchestra while still in high school. He studied music at the University of Illinois and the Cleveland Institute of Music. In 1938 he joined the Indianapolis Symphony Orchestra as an oboe player. By this time he had also written a number of music compositions -- achieving a national reputation as a composer with his first two symphonies which were written for the Pittsburg Symphony Orchestra. From 1942 to 1946 he taught woodwind instruments at Yale University and studied composition under Paul Hindemuth. In 1946 he returned to the University of Illinois as a teacher of composition, leaving there in 1949 to go to Smith College, where he lives at the present time, teaching composition.

His experiences as an oboist and his general knowledge of the woodwind and brass instruments has been used to a great advantage in the works he has written for wind instruments. His Quintet No. 2 in four movements, is an excellent example. While the work is not easy to play, it does make excellent use of the potential of the five instruments of the woodwind quintet.

E. David Diamond

David Diamond also comes from the eastern part of the United States. He was born in Rochester. New York, on July 9, 1915. His musical talent became obvious at an early age, and when he was 13, he went to the Cleveland Institute of Music to study composition. In 1930, at the age of 15, he entered the Eastman School of Music and studied composition under the American composer Bernard Rogers. Upon graduation from Eastman School of Music he went to France and studied with Nadia Boulanger, the famous teacher in Paris who has inspired many of the contemporary American composers.

He first achieved recognition as a composer in 1935 with his First Symphony in D for Orchestra, and the work Threnody. From that time to the present he has written a large number of works for orchestra, choral groups, string quartets as well as the Quintet for Woodwinds which you will hear a portion of on the concert. For the past several years he has lived and composed in Italy. However, he spends a few months each year in the United States where his works are most frequently performed. His work, Rounds For Orchestra, composed in 1944, has been performed a number of times by the Cincinnati Symphony Orchestra.

You will hear the second movement of his Quintet. This work was written in 1958 and has become a standard work, played quite regularly by woodwind quintets in this country. The second movement is entitled Theme and Variations and points up the versatility of the instruments of the Woodwind Quintet.

Appendix D

COLLEGE-CONSERVATORY OF MUSIC WOODWIND QUINTET
SPECIAL CONCERT
FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 12, 1965 — 1:00 P.M.
WILSON AUDITORIUM

RESPONSE SHEET	LIKE VERY MUCH	LIKE A LITTLE	CANNOT DECIDE DO NOT KNOW	DISLIKE A LITTLE	DISLIKE VERY MUCH
Persichetti ---------------------------------- PASTORAL	+2	+1	0	–1	–2
Diamond --- --------------- THEME AND VARIATIONS	+2	+1	0	–1	–2
Etier ------------------------------- QUINTET No. TWO					
First Movement, Andante con moto	+2	+1	0	–1	–2
Second Movement, Allegro commodo	+2	+1	0	–1	–2
Third Movement, Adagio	+2	+1	0	–1	–2
Fourth Movement, Vivace	+2	+1	0	–1	–2
Sydeman --------------------------- QUINTET No. TWO					
First Movement, Allegro	+2	+1	0	–1	–2
Second Movement, Allegro	+2	+1	0	–1	–2

SPECIAL INSTRUCTIONS: After you hear each movement, select the number which refers to the statement that best describes how you feel about the music, and draw a circle around that number.

APPENDIX E

Stylistic Analysis of Compositions Performed at the First Concert

The first concert of the Exposition of Contemporary American Music was presented on Tuesday, May 4, 1965. The performing group was the LaSalle Quartet. The order of performance was:

1.	Quartet No. One	Gunther Schuller
2.	Nine Variations (1959)	Ben Johnston
3.	Quartet (1949)	Leon Kirchner

1. Schuller, Gunther - Quartet No. One. Performed by the LaSalle Quartet. Duration - 16 minutes.

Summary of Analysis

Statements reflecting characteristics that pervade the composition.

11. Could not hear a melody
14. Dissonant sounds
19. Disjointed series of sounds (pointillistic)
20. Sounds like atonal music
29. String instrument color
35. Lack of strong rhythmic feeling

Statements reflecting characteristics significant, but only in a portion of the composition.

1. Spiritual, serious, inspiring
2. Heavy, gloomy, pathetic
4. Quiet, lyrical, satisfying, calm
7. Dramatic, agitated, exciting, triumphant
9. Irregular melodic contour, disjointed (angular)
12. Block chordal structure
16. Masses or blocks of sounds
17. Lack of recognizable structure
18. Orderliness of structure
21. Interweaving of melodies (contrapuntal)
23. Extreme pitch ranges (high-low) of the music
26. Simple texture
31. Dynamic contrast of music
33. Percussive rhythms

Statements reflecting characteristics present, but peripheral.

6. Bright, cheerful, gay
10. Lyric melody
15. Consonant sounds
25. Cluttered texture, busy music
34. Repetitive rhythms

General Statement

This Quartet consists of three separate movements, each using serial technique. The first movement is pulled together by a triplet motive and the string portamento device. The second movement quotes the "fate motive" from Beethoven's Fifth Symphony as its principle thematic idea. The third movement, in a closed form, uses a pedal point in the first and last sections.

The work may be described as dissonant, pointillistic, and atonal.

2. Johnston, Ben - Nine Variations (1959). Performed by the LaSalle Quartet. Duration - 19 minutes.

Summary of Analysis

Statements reflecting characteristics that pervade the composition.

1. Spiritual, serious, inspiring
9. Irregular melodic contour, disjointed (angular)
14. Dissonant sounds
16. Masses or blocks of sounds
17. Lack of recognizable structure
19. Disjointed series of sounds (pointillistic)
20. Sounds like atonal music
29. String instrument color

Statements reflecting characteristics significant, but only in a portion of the composition.

4. Quiet, lyrical, satisfying, calm
7. Dramatic, agitated, exciting, triumphant
11. Could not hear a melody
12. Block chordal structure
21. Interweaving of melodies (contrapuntal)
23. Extreme pitch ranges (high-low) of the music
26. Simple texture
31. Dynamic contrast of music
35. Lack of strong rhythmic feeling

Statements reflecting characteristics present, but peripheral.

2. Heavy, gloomy, pathetic
5. Humorous, light, graceful
8. Majestic, martial, vigorous
10. Lyric melody
13. Changing tonality

15. Consonant sounds
18. Orderliness of structure
22. Chordal accompaniment of a single melody
27. Strange orchestral effects
32. Percussion color
34. Repetitive rhythms
36. Irregular rhythms
37. Tempo or speed of the music

General Statement

The Nine Variations utilizes a large closed variational form based on a simple theme which consists of a crescendo on a sustained tone ending with a staccato attack. The variations are grouped in the pattern 3 + 3 + 1 + 2. The sixth variation is notable for its use of the rhythmic pattern of one quarter note and two eighth notes.

The work is quite dissonant, pointillistic, and makes extensive use of contrasting periods of sound and silence. The use of silence as a structural characteristic creates a disjointed effect and serves as a tension building device.

3. Kirchner, Leon - Quartet (1949). Performed by the LaSalle Quartet. Duration - 18 minutes.

Summary of Analysis

Statements reflecting characteristics that pervade the composition.

10. Lyric melody
29. String instrument color

Statements reflecting characteristics significant, but only in a portion of the composition.

1. Spiritual, serious, inspiring
2. Heavy, gloomy, pathetic
3. Sentimental, tender, pleading
4. Quiet, lyrical, satisfying, calm
6. Bright, cheerful, gay

7. Dramatic, agitated, exciting, triumphant
12. Block chordal structure
13. Changing tonality
14. Dissonant sounds
15. Consonant sounds
16. Masses or blocks of sounds
17. Lack of recognizable structure
18. Orderliness of structure
20. Sounds like atonal music
21. Interweaving of melodies (contrapuntal)
26. Simple texture
35. Lack of strong rhythmic feeling

Statements reflecting characteristics present, but peripheral.

5. Humorous, light, graceful
8. Majestic, martial, vigorous
11. Could not hear a melody
22. Chordal accompaniment of a single melody
25. Cluttered texture, busy music
27. Strange orchestral effects
31. Dynamic contrast of music
33. Percussive rhythms
34. Repetitive rhythms
36. Irregular rhythms
37. Tempo or speed of the music

General Statement

This quartet, in four movements, is not a pastiche, but does involve the use of many coloristic devices and doublings of impressionism and the string techniques of Bartok. The composer adhered to established forms. The first movement is a first rondo with transitions and a small development section. The second and fourth movements are through composed. The third movement is a first rondo with the reprise a fanciful variation.

In contrast to the first two compositions of this concert, the quartet is lyrical and utilizes traditional harmonies, at times with a feeling of changing tonality, and at other times, with a sense of a tonal center.

APPENDIX F

Stylistic Analyses of Compositions Performed at the Second Concert

The second concert of the Exposition of Contemporary American Music was presented on Wednesday evening, May 5, 1965. Members of the artist faculty of the College-Conservatory of Music of the University of Cincinnati were presented in performance of a varied program. The order of performance was:

1.	Feldeinsamkeit (1898)	Charles E. Ives
2.	Watchman! (1913)	Charles E. Ives
3.	The Cage (1906)	Charles E. Ives
4.	Thoreau (1915)	Charles E. Ives
5.	General William Booth enteres into Heaven (1914)	Charles E. Ives
	Four Epitaphs, Op. 79 (1964)	Jeno Takacs
6.	Praeludium (for Paul Hindemuth)	
7.	Elegie (for Claude Debussy)	
8.	A fragment (for Alban Berg)	
9.	Dialogue-Nocturne (for Bela Bartok)	
	Five Poems (Goethe)	Robert K. Evans
10.	Blick um Blick	
11.	Dem aufgehenden Vollmonde	
12.	Finnisches Lied	
13.	Im Vorubergehen	
14.	Gleich und Gleich	
15.	Sonata Concertante (for violin and piano)	Peter Mennin
16.	Quintet for Winds	Daniel Kingman
17.	Woodwind Quintet No. Two	William Sydeman

1. Ives, Charles E. - Feldeinsamkeit (1898). Performed by Lewis E. Whikehart, baritone, with Robert K. Evans, pianist. Duration - 3 minutes.

Summary of Analysis

Statements reflecting characteristics that pervade the composition.

1. Spiritual, serious, inspiring
3. Sentimental, tender, pleading
4. Quiet, lyrical, satisfying, calm
10. Lyric melody
15. Consonant sounds
18. Orderliness of structure
22. Chordal accompaniment of a single melody
26. Simple texture
30. Voice/choral color

Statements reflecting characteristics significant, but only in a portion of the composition.

35. Lack of strong rhythmic feeling
37. Tempo or speed of the music

Statements reflecting characteristics present, but peripheral.

none

General Statement

A setting of a lovely nineteenth century German lyric poem, in the idiom of Faure or Hahn.

A lyrical vocal line is spun out over arpeggiated chordal texture in the piano. It is extremely consonant --- in a tranquil mood --- in the key of D flat major. Harmonically this song could have been written as early as 1850. There is nothing remotely approaching the twentieth century idiom in this work.

2. Ives, Charles E. - Watchman (1913). Performed by Lewis E. Whikehart, baritone, with Robert K. Evans, pianist. Duration - 2 minutes.

Summary of Analysis

Statements reflecting characteristics that pervade the composition.

1. Spiritual, serious, inspiring
4. Quiet, lyrical, satisfying, calm
10. Lyric melody
12. Block chordal structure
15. Consonant sounds
16. Masses or blocks of sounds
18. Orderliness of structure
22. Chordal accompaniment of a single melody
26. Simple texture
30. Voice/choral color
36. Irregular rhythms
37. Tempo or speed of the music

Statements reflecting characteristics significant, but only in a portion of the song.

none

Statements reflecting characteristics present, but peripheral.

14. Dissonant sounds

General Statement

This song was "adapted", as the composer says, from his second violin sonata. It uses Lowell Mason's well-known hymn tune, a typical example of Ive's preoccupation with American hymn tunes and gospel songs. It contains a short piano introduction.

The work is tonal, in the key of D major. The hymn tune is in 6/8 meter, with a piano accompaniment in 3/4 meter, thus producing a hemiola effect throughout the song. There is a picturesque suggestion of the "star" referred to in the text by a soft dissonant high tone. There is an interesting use of dialogue effect between "watchmen" and the "traveler." The sonorities are quite consonant. The melody is somewhat distorted rhythmic modifications, a beat off here, a beat early there. The piano introduction is much more cluttered and complex than the rest of the song which is simple and direct.

3. Ives, Charles E. - The Cage (1906). Performed by Lewis E. Whikehart, baritone, with Robert K. Evans, pianist, Duration - less than one minute.

Summary of Analysis

Statements reflecting characteristics that pervade the composition.

2. Heavy, gloomy, pathetic
12. Block chordal structure
14. Dissonant sounds
16. Masses or block of sounds
17. Lack of recognizable structure
20. Sounds like atonal music
22. Chordal accompaniment of a single melody
26. Simple texture
30. Voice/choral color
34. Repetitive rhythms
35. Lack of strong rhythmic feeling

Statements reflecting characteristics significant, but only in a portion of the song.

none

Statements reflecting characteristics present, but peripheral.

none

General Statement

A whimsical and "deadpan" treatment of the provocative text (also by Ives). The most obvious feature of the song is the use of quartel sonorities throughout. No other chords are used at all!

There is "humor" in this song, but the mood is not "humorous, light or graceful." The melody is not lyrical, but it is entirely conjunct, monotonous, as a matter of fact, suggesting (along with the plodding accompaniment) the bored, restless pacing back and forth of the caged leopard. The ending is very inconclusive --- the music simply breaks off with no suggestion of a convincing harmonic or melodic cadence. The interesting rhythmic effect is produced by the almost total lack of any coordination between voice and piano.

4. Ives, Charles E. - Thoreau (1915). Performed by Lewis E. Whikehart, baritone, with Robert K. Evans, pianist. Duration - 1½ minutes.

Summary of Analysis

Statements reflecting characteristics that pervade the song.

1. Spiritual, serious, inspiring
4. Quiet, lyrical, satisfying, calm
10. Lyric melody
12. Block chordal structure
15. Consonant sounds
16. Masses or blocks of sounds
18. Orderliness of structure
22. Chordal accompaniment of a single melody
23. Extreme pitch ranges (high-low) of the music
26. Simple texture
30. Voice/choral color
34. Repetitive rhythms
35. Lack of strong rhythmic feeling
37. Tempo or speed of the music

Statements reflecting characteristics significant, but only in a portion of the song.

none

Statements reflecting characteristics present, but peripheral.

none

General Statement

This work was written in 1951 to Ive's own text. In the first measure of the piano part appears a long, "mood-setting" quotation from Walden, very pan-theistic.

The song uses themes from Ive's second piano sonata. The tempo is extremely slow. Sonorities are quite consonant, basically built in thirds. The song is quiet, meditative, and almost motionless throughout.

5. Ives, Charles E. - General William Booth Enters into Heaven. Performed by Lewis E. Whikehart, baritone, with Robert K. Evans, pianist. Duration - 6 minutes.

Summary of Analysis

Statements reflecting characteristics that pervade the song.

12. Block chordal structure
16. Masses or blocks of sounds
17. Lack of recognizable structure
22. Chordal accompaniment of a single melody
25. Cluttered texture, busy music
30. Voice/choral color
31. Dynamic contrast of music
33. Percussive rhythms
34. Repetitive rhythms
36. Irregular rhythms
37. Tempo or speed of the music

Statements reflecting characteristics significant, but only in a portion of the song.

1. Spiritual, serious, inspiring
6. Bright, cheerful, gay
7. Dramatic, agitated, exciting, triumphant
8. Majestic, martial, vigorous
10. Lyric melody
14. Dissonant sounds
15. Consonant sounds

Statements reflecting characteristics present, but peripheral.

13. Changing tonality

General Statement

This song was written in 1914 to Vachel Lindsay's famous text. Ives used segments of the gospel song "There is a Fountain Filled With Blood," particularly part of the refrain: "Are you washed in the Blook of the Lamb?" The latter question is virtually an *idee fixe* throughout the song.

The song is a roistering setting, appropriate to the bombastic text which begins: "Booth led boldly with his big bass drum." The gospel song melody is woven through the song, appearing in many different guises and contexts, often quite distorted. The whole tune appears as a grand climax or apotheosis near the end. Rhythm is an important factor, very percussive and repetitive. There is considerable use of syncopation and other rhythmic and metric irregularities. Imitation of a snare drum in the piano. The piano accompaniment is very dissonant and complex, using some tone clusters.

6. Takacs, Jeno - Four Epitaphs, Op. 79., Praeludium (for Paul Hindemith). Performed by Jeno Takacs, pianist. Duration - 3 minutes.

Summary of Analysis

Statements reflecting characteristics that pervade the composition.

11. Could not hear a melody
14. Dissonant sounds
16. Masses or blocks of sounds
17. Lack of recognizable structure
26. Simple texture

Statements reflecting characteristics significant, but only in a portion of the composition.

2. Heavy, gloomy, pathetic
7. Dramatic, agitated, exciting, triumphant
9. Irregular melodic contour, disjointed (angular)
12. Block chordal structure
20. Sounds like atonal music
21. Interweaving of melodies (contrapuntal)
23. Extreme pitch ranges (high-low) of the music
24. Ornamentation of melodies
31. Dynamic contrast of music
36. Irregular rhythms

Statements reflecting characteristics present, but peripheral.

1. Spiritual, serious, inspiring
13. Changing tonality
19. Disjointed series of sounds (pointillistic)
37. Tempo or speed of the music

General Statement

Each of the Four Epitaphs is a stylistic "homage" to a major twentieth century European composer. Takacs has selected for each piece a texture, a mood, a form, and an overall harmonic, melodic, and rhythmic style appropriate to the composer named. All four are elegiac in general character, and all four are free and quasi-improvisatory in style. The rhythm is so free and unmeasured (seemingly) that the pieces suggest rather extensive and highly organized cadenzas. These compositions are not atonal, although they may give that impression to the untrained listener.

In Praeludium, quartel sonorities predominate (more so than in Hindemith's music). However, the general impression is not one of extreme dissonance. It features a typical Hindemuth dotted rhythmic pattern.

It exploits both the low and high registers of the piano. The title is indicative, since the texture and melodic development of this piece is similar to the Baroque "praeludium". It is similar also to the opening section of Hindemuth's Ludus Tonalis which might have provided the generating idea for this composition.

7. Takacs, Jeno - Four Epitaphs, Op. 79, Elegie (for Claude Debussy). Performed by Jeno Takacs, pianist. Duration - 3 minutes.

Summary of Analysis

Statements reflecting characteristics that pervade the composition.

16. Masses or blocks of sounds
18. Orderliness of structure
26. Simple texture
35. Lack of strong rhythmic feeling

Statements reflecting characteristics significant, but only in a portion of the composition.

2. Heavy, gloomy, pathetic
7. Dramatic, agitated, exciting, triumphant
9. Irregular melodic contour, disjointed (angular)
10. Lyric melody
14. Dissonant sounds
20. Sounds like atonal music

Statements reflecting characteristics present, but peripheral.

1. Spiritual, serious, inspiring
3. Sentimental, tender, pleading
12. Block chordal structure
23. Extreme pitch ranges (high-low) of the music
24. Ornamentation of melodies

General Statement

(See No. 6 for a general comment relating to the Four Epitaphs.)

The sonorities in this piece are some favorites of Debussy, for example, a quartal chord with one perfect fourth and one tritone, and many chords featuring major second dissonances. The tempo is slow. The texture is predominantly a lohg spun-out melodic line in one voice or in octaves sparsely punctuated with rhythmic chords. The mood is sombre and grey. There is some use of chords with open fifths. The melody is lyrical, but it is not diatonic and has some hints of angularity in it.

8. Takacs, Jeno - Four Epitaphs, Op. 79, A Fragment (for Alban Berg). Performed by Jeno Takacs, pianist. Duration - 3 minutes.

Summary of Analysis

Statements reflecting characteristics that pervade the composition.

9. Irregular melodic contour, disjointed (angular)
11. Could not hear a melody
14. Dissonant sounds
17. Lack of recognizable structure
20. Sounds like atonal music
21. Interweaving of melodies (contrapuntal)
36. Irregular rhythms

Statements reflecting characteristics significant, but only in a portion of the composition.

2. Heavy, gloomy, pathetic
7. Dramatic, agitated, exciting, triumphant
8. Majestic, martial, vigorous
12. Block chordal structure
16. Masses or blocks of sounds
19. Disjointed series of sounds (pointillistic)
23. Extreme pitch ranges (high-low) of the music
25. Cluttered texture, busy music
31. Dynamic contrast of music
35. Lack of strong rhythmic feeling
37. Tempo or speed of the music

Statements reflecting characteristics present, but peripheral.

none

General Statement

(See No. 6 for a general comment relating to the Four Epitaphs.)

This piece is in a faster tempo than the preceding two slow pieces. Again the rhythm is quasi-improvisatory. This composition is highly contrapuntal with angular and disjunct lines. It does sound atonal and is pointillistic at times. One passage sounds very much like the end of Berg's Wozzeck, soft, high repeated mildly-dissonant chords.

9. Takacs, Jeno - *Four Epitaphs*, Op. 79, *Dialogue-Nocturne* (for Bela Bartok). Performed by Jeno Takacs, pianist. Duration - 3 minutes.

Summary of Analysis

Statements reflecting characteristics that pervade the composition.

9. Irregular melodic contour, disjointed (angular)
14. Dissonant sounds
21. Interweaving of melodies (contrapuntal)
11. Could not hear a melody

Statements reflecting characteristics significant, but only in a portion of the composition.

1. Spiritual, serious, inspiring
2. Heavy, gloomy, pathetic
7. Dramatic, agitated, exciting, triumphant
8. Majestic, martial, vigorous
16. Masses or blocks of sounds
17. Lack of recognizable structure
20. Sounds like atonal music
23. Extreme pitch ranges (high-low) of the music
24. Ornamentation of melodies
25. Cluttered texture, busy music
26. Simple texture

Statements reflecting characteristics present, but peripheral.

31. Dynamic contrast of music
35. Lack of strong rhythmic feeling
36. Irregular rhythms

General Statement

(See No. 6 for a general comment relating to the *Four Epitaphs*.)

This piece is the most contrapuntal of the set and is full of canons and stretto. Prominent also are acciaccature in the melodic line. The sonorities are quite dissonant, many with the major seventh interval. Much of the piece is in only two voices in dissonant counterpoint. Other sections feature pairs of voices in stretto imitation and canon at dissonant intervals. The individual lines are fairly diatonic, but with variable scale steps, namely, c - d - e - f - e flat - d flat - c. This piece suggests some of the pieces from Bartok's *Mikrokosmos*.

10. Evans, Robert K. - Five Poems (Goethe), Blick um Blick. Performed by Lucille Villeneuve Evans, mezzo-contralto, with Robert K. Evans, pianist. Duration - 2 minutes.

Summary of Analysis

Statements reflecting characteristics that pervade the composition.

7. Dramatic, agitated, exciting, triumphant
8. Majestic, martial, vigorous
15. Consonant sounds
30. Voice/choral color
34. Repetitive rhythms

Statements reflecting characteristics significant, but only in a portion of the composition.

10. Lyric melody
12. Block chordal structure
18. Orderliness of structure
25. Cluttered texture, busy music

Statements reflecting characteristics present, but peripheral.

6. Bright, cheerful, gay
13. Changing tonality
16. Masses or blocks of sounds
22. Chordal accompaniment of a single melody
26. Simple texture
31. Dynamic contrast of music
37. Tempo or speed of the music

General Statement

Five Poems are settings of poems of Goethe with scrupulous attention to the subleties and inflections of the texts. All five songs have an extremely active piano part which generally contains most of the rhythmic and melodic interest of the song. The overall style is highly conservative, close to the harmonic and melodic idiom of Kilpinen or Sibelius. The vocal line is more declamatory than lyric. The most common type of vocal line is one with many repeated notes or repetitions of a short motive. The method of construction appears to be built around a characteristic motive, usually a short rhythmic figure not more than three to five beats long. The motive is then repeated in different melodic sequences, registers, inversions, etc., and continues for the duration of the song.

Blick um Blick is tonal, highly consonant, in a major key, with regular and metrical rhythm. It contains a brilliant vocal melisma near the end.

11. Evans, Robert K. - Five Poems (Goethe), Dem aufgehenden Vollmonde. Performed by Lucile Villeneuve Evans, mezzo-contralto, with Robert K. Evans, pianist. Duration - 2 minutes.

Summary of Analysis

Statements reflecting characteristics that pervade the composition.

7. Dramatic, agitated, exciting, triumphant
8. Majestic, martial, vigorous
30. Voice/choral color
34. Repetitive rhythms

Statements reflecting characteristics significant, but only in a portion of the composition.

2. Heavy, gloomy, pathetic
9. Irregular melodic contour, disjointed (angular)
15. Consonant sounds
18. Orderliness of structure
25. Cluttered texture, busy music
31. Dynamic contrast of music
37. Tempo or speed of the music

Statements reflecting characteristics present, but peripheral.

10. Lyric melody
12. Block chordal structure
13. Changing tonality
14. Dissonant sounds
16. Masses or blocks of sounds
22. Chordal accompaniment of a single melody

General Statement

(See No. 10 for a general comment relating to the Five Poems.)

This song begins gently and rises to a big climax, accelerating as the song progresses. It is somewhat dissonant, very active and rhythmic. There is almost consistent sixteenth note motion throughout the song in the piano accompaniment.

12. Evans, Robert K. - Five Poems (Goethe), Finnisches Lied. Performed by Lucile Villeneuve Evans, mezzo-contralto, with Robert K. Evans, pianist. Duration - 2 minutes.

Summary of Analysis

Statements reflecting characteristics that pervade the composition.

8. Majestic, martial, vigorous
10. Lyric melody
15. Consonant sounds
30. Voice/choral color
34. Repetitive rhythms

Statements reflecting characteristics significant, but only in a portion of the composition.

4. Quiet, lyrical, satisfying, calm
5. Humorous, light, graceful
12. Block chordal structure
16. Masses or blocks of sounds
18. Orderliness of structure
22. Chordal accompaniment of a single melody
26. Simple texture
31. Dynamic contrast of music

Statements reflecting characteristics present, but peripheral.

21. Interweaving of melodies (contrapuntal)
25. Cluttered texture, busy music
37. Tempo or speed of the music

General Statement

(See No. 10 for a general comment relating to the Five Poems.)

This song is in 5/4 meter, has a modal flavor (dorian/aeolian), and very consonant. It is a gentle scherzo in F minor, and ends on a quintal chord. The same melodic figuration continues throughout the piano part. There is some use of counterpoint in the form of a countermelody (more lyrical) to the main rhythmic motive.

13. Evans, Robert K. - Five Poems (Goethe), Im Vordbergehen. Performed by Lucile Velleneuve Evans, mezzo-contralto, with Robert K. Evans, pianist. Duration - 2 minutes.

Summary of Analysis

Statements reflecting characteristics that pervade the composition.

5. Humorous, light, graceful
6. Bright, cheerful, gay
7. Dramatic, agitated, exciting, triumphant
30. Voice/choral color
34. Repetitive rhythms
36. Irregular rhythms

Statements reflecting characteristics significant, but only in a portion of the composition.

9. Irregular melodic contour, disjointed (angular)
10. Lyric melody
12. Block chordal structure
15. Consonant sounds

18. Orderliness of structure
25. Cluttered texture, busy music
31. Dynamic contrast of music
37. Tempo or speed of the music

Statements reflecting characteristics present, but peripheral.

13. Changing tonality
14. Dissonant sounds
16. Masses or blocks of sounds
22. Chordal accompaniment of a single melody

General Statement

(See No. 10 for a general comment relating to the Five Poems.)

In this song there is much syncopation, a predominant part of the main piano figuration. It ends on a major triad. The song is tonal, although this is partially disguised by the use of many chromatic decorative tones in the piano figuration. Rhythm is the most significant factor in the song. The tempo is fast with much drive and momentum.

14. Evans, Robert K. - Five Poems (Goethe), Gleich und Gleich. Performed by Lucile Velleneuve Evans, mezzo-contralto, with Robert K. Evans, pianist. Duration - less than a minute.

Summary of Analysis

Statements reflecting characteristics that pervade the composition.

7. Dramatic, agitated, exciting, triumphant
8. Majestic, martial, vigorous
25. Cluttered texture, busy music
30. Voice/choral color
34. Repetitive rhythms
36. Irregular rhythms

Statements reflecting characteristics significant, but only in a portion of the composition.

10. Lyric melody
15. Consonant sounds
17. Lack of recognizable structure

Statements reflecting characteristics present, but peripheral.

6. Bright, cheerful, gay
12. Block chordal structure
14. Dissonant sounds
16. Masses or blocks of sounds
37. Tempo or speed of the music

General Statement

(See No. 10 for a general comment relating to the Five Poems.)

The meter is not clear. The song ends on a fortissimo major triad. It is very tonal, diatonic, and consonant. The tempo is fast. The vocal line is again declamatory, rather than lyrical, with many repeated notes. The rhythm of the vocal part is primarily quarter notes as opposed to the sixteenth note motion in the piano part.

15. Mennin, Peter - Sonata Concertante. Performed by Sigmund Effron, violinist, and Babette Effron, pianist. Duration - 20 minutes.

Summary of Analysis

Statements reflecting characteristics that pervade the composition.

21. Interweaving of melodies (contrapuntal)
29. String instrument color
33. Percussive rhythms
34. Repetitive rhythms

Statements reflecting characteristics significant, but only in a portion of the composition.

3. Sentimental, tender, pleading
7. Dramatic, agitated, exciting, triumphant
9. Irregular melodic contour, disjointed (angular)
10. Lyric melody
12. Block chordal structure
14. Dissonant sounds
15. Consonant sounds
16. Masses or blocks of sounds
18. Orderliness of structure
20. Sounds like atonal music
22. Chordal accompaniment of a single melody
23. Extreme pitch ranges (high-low) of the music
25. Cluttered texture, busy music
26. Simple texture
31. Dynamic contrast of music
36. Irregular rhythms
37. Tempo or speed of the music

Statements reflecting characteristics present, but peripheral.

8. Majestic, martial, vigorous
11. Could not hear a melody
13. Changing tonality

General Statement

This work is a three movement sonata for violin and piano, written in 1958. There are basically two types of music in this piece. The first and third movements (the faster sections) contain a vigorous, rhythmic, agitated type of music with much syncopation, perpetual motion rhythms, changing meters, shifted accent, and much sinewy counterpoint. There is almost no harmonic dimension in these sections.

The slower section features chordal texture for the piano, hands often widely spaced, with much contrary motion. There is a lyrical line in the violin part, with a very low bass line in the piano part. The work utilizes mostly consonant sonorities (minor triads, in particular). There is some use of polychords. The music is put together through the welding of short, scrappy, irregular rhythmic motives.

16. Kingman, Daniel - Quintet for Winds. Performed by the College-Conservatory of Music Woodwind Quintet. Duration - 11 minutes.

Summary of Analysis

Statements reflecting characteristics that pervade the composition.

20. Sounds like atonal music
21. Interweaving of melodies (contrapuntal)
28. Wind instrument color

Statements reflecting characteristics significant, but only in a portion of the composition.

3. Sentimental, tender, pleading
4. Quiet, lyrical, satisfying, calm
5. Humorous, light, graceful
7. Dramatic, agitated, exciting, triumphant
8. Majestic, martial, vigorous
9. Irregular melodic contour, disjointed (angular)
11. Could not hear a melody
14. Dissonant sounds
17. Lack of recognizable structure
18. Orderliness of structure
25. Cluttered texture, busy music
261 Simple texture
31. Dynamic contrast of music
34. Repetitive rhythms
36. Irregular rhythms
37. Tempo or speed of the music

Statements reflecting characteristics present, but peripheral.

10. Lyric melody
12. Block chordal structure
13. Changing tonality
15. Consonant sounds
16. Masses or blocks of sounds
22. Chordal accompaniment of a single melody
23. Extreme pitch ranges (high-low) of the music
33. Percussive rhythms

General Statement

The quintet is a three movement work. It is a serial piece that uses the twelve-tone row in a relatively simple and unsophisticated way. Despite the serialism the quintet is conservative in styles and fairly traditional in its use of rhythm, meter, form, thematic development, use of instruments, etc. It is an "academic" work. It is atonal.

17. Sydeman, William - Woodwind Quintet No. Two. Performed by the College-Conservatory of Music Woodwind Quintet. Duration - 14 minutes.

Summary of Analysis

Statements reflecting characteristics that pervade the composition.

9. Irregular melodic contour, disjointed (angular)
11. Could not hear a melody
14. Dissonant sounds
17. Lack of recognizable structure
19. Disjointed series of sounds (pointillistic)
20. Sounds like atonal music
21. Interweaving of melodies (contrapuntal)
23. Extreme pitch ranges (high-low) of the music
25. Cluttered texture, busy music
28. Wind instrument color
36. Irregular rhythms

Statements reflecting characteristics significant, but only in a portion of the composition.

2. Heavy, gloomy, pathetic
3. Sentimental, tender, pleading
7. Dramatic, agitated, exciting, triumphant
16. Masses or blocks of sounds
31. Dynamic contrast of music
33. Percussive rhythms
35. Lack of strong rhythmic feeling
37. Tempo or speed of the music

Statements reflecting characteristics present, but peripheral.

5. Humorous, light, graceful
10. Lyric melody
24. Ornamentation of melodies
34. Repetitive rhythms

General Statement

This is a four movement quintet for woodwinds. It is a provocative, "difficult," and even a controversial composition. It is atonal but non-serial, fragmentary, choppy, pointillistic; an extension of the post-Webern school of writing. The most significant elements are tempo, rhythm, and meter. These are highly complex and irregular, and almost constantly in a state of flux. Rhythmic problems include polyrhythms, syncopation, ametrical rhythm. There is very little feeling for meter, because no rhythm is regular or persistent enough to suggest one.

It often sounds chaotic. The sonorities are highly dissonant. The melody is angular, disjunct, fragmentary, unpredictable, and covers a wide range. It contains primarily dissonant intervals. The quintet is a very difficult work to perform.

APPENDIX G

Stylistic Analyses of Compositions Performed at the Third Concert

The third concert of the Exposition of Contemporary American Music was presented on Thursday, May 6, 1965. The performing groups were the University of Cincinnati College-Conservatory of Music Brass Choir and Symphonic Wind Ensemble. The order of performance was:

1.	Chorale-Partita for Brass and Percussion	Lewis Rowell
2.	Music for Brass	Wallingford Riegger
3.	"Specifics"	Scott Huston
4.	Variants on a Mediaeval Tune	Norman Dello Joio

1. Rowell, Lewis - Chorale-Partita for Brass and Percussion. Performed by the College-Conservatory of Music Brass Choir, Ernest N. Glover, conducting. Duration - 10 minutes.

Summary of Analysis

Statements reflecting characteristics that pervade the composition.

14. Dissonant sounds
28. Wind instrument color
31. Dynamic contrast of music
33. Percussive rhythms
34. Repetitive rhythms
37. Tempo or speed of the music

Statements reflecting characteristics significant, but only in a portion of the composition.

7. Dramatic, agitated, exciting, triumphant
8. Majestic, martial, vigorous
12. Block chordal structure
16. Masses or blocks of sounds
18. Orderliness of structure
21. Interweaving of melodies (contrapuntal)
25. Cluttered texture, busy music
26. Simple texture

Statements reflecting characteristics present, but peripheral.

2. Heavy, gloomy, pathetic
10. Lyric melody
22. Chordal accompaniment of a single melody

General Statement

This work is written for three trumpets, four horns, three trombones, euphonium, tuba, and percussion. It is based on the chorale Jesu, meine Freude. The composition is Neo-Baroque in style and format, divided into seven parts as follows:

Theme - allegro brusco
Variation 1 - adagio
Variation 2 - allegro molto marcato (canons)
Variation 3 - scherzando (chorale prelude)
Variation 4 - andante mesto (passacaglia)
Variation 5 - presto (ostinato)
Chorale - maestoso

The mood, texture, tempo, dynamic level, and general character change with each variation. The tempi are predominantly brisk, and rhythm is perhaps the most significant factor in the work. The composition is tonal and diatonic, utilizing dissonance extensively.

2. Riegger, Wellingford - Music for Brass. Performed by the College-Conservatory of Music Brass Choir, Ernest N. Glover, conducting. Duration - 10 minutes.

Summary of Analysis

Statements reflecting characteristics that pervade the composition.

14. Dissonant sounds
16. Masses or blocks of sounds
20. Sounds like atonal music
28. Wind instrument color

Statements reflecting characteristics significant, but only in a portion of the composition.

2. Heavy, gloomy, pathetic
7. Dramatic, agitated, exciting, triumphant
8. Majestic, martial, vigorous
9. Irregular melodic contour, disjointed (angular)
11. Could not hear a melody
12. Block chordal structure
18. Orderliness of structure
21. Interweaving of melodies (contrapuntal)
25. Cluttered texture, busy music
31. Dynamic contrast of music
35. Lack of strong rhythmic feeling
36. Irregular rhythms

Statements reflecting characteristics present, but peripheral.

6. Bright, cheerful, gay
19. Disjointed series of sounds (pointillistic)
32. Percussion color
34. Repetitive rhythms

General Statement

This work is written for ten trumpets, four horns, ten trombones, two tubas, tympani, and cymbals. The form is a riternello with occasional points of imitation. The most striking feature of the composition is its use of tone clusters, usually in clusters of ten tones, and other rich harmonies. Dissonant sounds are predominant and there is no obvious tonal center.

3. Huston, Scott - Specifics. Performed by the College-Conservatory of Music Symphonic Wind Ensemble, Ernest N. Glover, conducting. Duration - 10 minutes.

Summary of Analysis

Statements reflecting characteristics that pervade the composition.

8. Majestic, martial, vigorous
18. Orderliness of structure
28. Wind instrument color

Statements reflecting characteristics significant, but only in a portion of the composition.

1. Spiritual, serious, inspiring
4. Quiet, lyrical, satisfying, calm
6. Bright, cheerful, gay
10. Lyric melody
12. Block chordal structure
13. Changing tonality
14. Dissonant sounds
15. Consonant sounds
21. Interweaving of melodies (contrapuntal)
26. Simple texture
31. Dynamic contrast of music

Statements reflecting characteristics present, but peripheral.

2. Heavy, gloomy, pathetic
7. Dramatic, agitated, exciting, triumphant
16. Masses or blocks of sounds

23. Extreme pitch ranges (high-low) of the music
25. Cluttered texture, busy music
27. Strange orchestral effects
32. Percussion color
33. Percussive rhythms
34. Repetitive rhythms
36. Irregular rhythms

General Statement

"Specifics" for band employs an arch form with introduction. The first theme is vigorous and contrasted with a quiet second idea. The coda utilizes massive blocks of sounds. The work exploits the minor third with added second. Effective use of the many coloristic possibilities of the wind ensemble is quite apparent.

4. Dello Joio, Norman - Variants on a Mediaeval Tune. Performed by the College-Conservatory of Music Symphonic Wind Ensemble, Ernest N. Glover, conducting. Duration - 12 minutes.

Summary of Analysis

Statements reflecting characteristics that pervade the composition.

10. Lyric melody
12. Block chordal structure
15. Consonant sounds
28. Wind instrument color
31. Dynamic contrast of music

Statements reflecting characteristics significant, but only in a portion of the composition.

4. Quiet, lyrical, satisfying, calm
5. Humorous, light, graceful
6. Bright, cheerful, gay
7. Dramatic, agitated, exciting, triumphant
8. Majestic, martial, vigorous
16. Masses or blocks of sounds
18. Orderliness of structure
21. Interweaving of melodies (contrapuntal)

22. Chordal accompaniment of a single melody
23. Extreme pitch ranges (high-low) of the music
25. Cluttered texture, busy music
26. Simple texture
27. Strange orchestral effects
32. Percussion color
33. Percussive rhythms
34. Repetitive rhythms
37. Tempo or speed of the music

Statements reflecting characteristics present, but peripheral.

13. Changing tonality
14. Dissonant sounds
24. Ornamentation of melodies
36. Irregular rhythms

General Statement

This work is based on the old Christmas melody In dulci jubilo (often sung to the text "Good Christian Men, Rejoice"). The variational form is structured as follows:

Introduction - declamatory
Theme - semplice
Variation 1 - allegro deciso (sharply rhythmic)
Variation 2 - lento, pesante (massive and powerful)
Variation 3 - allegro spumantie (light and sparkling)
Variation 4 - andante (chordal, lyric)
Variation 5 - allegro gioioso (dancelike, ending
with a brilliant stretto canon)

The familiar melody is put through many interesting melodic and rhythmic transformations, however, it is usually recognizable. At times the work is extremely consonant. It is tonal and diatonic.

APPENDIX H

Stylistic Analyses of Compositions Performed at the Fourth Concert

The fourth concert of the Exposition of Contemporary American Music was presented on Friday, May 7, 1965. The performing groups were the University of Cincinnati College-Conservatory of Music Chorale and Chamber Singers. The order of performance was:

1. Processional: "Let there be light" (1901) Charles E. Ives
2. Rise up, my love, my fair one (Song of Solomon) (1929) Healey Willan
3. Monotone of the Rain (Carl Sandburg) (1937) Norman Lockwood
4. Mary Hynes, Op. 16, No. 1 (James Stephens)(1942) Samuel Barber
5. A Fable (Vachel Lindsay)(1946)Norman Dello Joio

Two Madrigals (Jose Garcia Villa) (1960) Felix Labunski

6. First, the poem must be magical
7. The Clock
8. The Silent Slain (Archibald MacLeish) (1960) James Ming
9. Nat Bacon's Bones (Archibald MacLeish) (1960) James Ming
10. Laughing Song (William Blake) (1956)Earl George
11. Snow (1949) Kenneth Gaburo
12. The Cry (1953) (F. J. Lorca) Kenneth Gaburo
13. Terra Tremuit (1957) Kenneth Gaburo
14. The Love of God (Bernard of Rascus) (1958) Lewis Whikehart

Excerpts from the Mass (1948) Igor Stravinsky

15. Kyrie
16. Agnus Dei

From "Five Statements" (1958-1962) Wilbur Ogdon

17. A Clear Midnight (Walt Whitman)
18. Madrigal (Thomas Campion)
19. The Last Invocation (Walt Whitman)
20. Geographical Fugue (1930) Ernet Toch
21. Psalm 23 (1954) George Rochberg

1. Ives, Charles E. - Processional: "Let There be Light". Performed by the College-Conservatory of Music Chorale, Lewis E. Whikehart, conducting, Ritter Werner, organist. Duration - 1½ minutes.

Summary of Analysis

Statements reflecting characteristics that pervade the composition.

1. Spiritual, serious, inspiring
30. Voice/choral color
35. Lack of strong rhythmic feeling

Statements reflecting characteristics significant, but only in a portion of the composition.

2. Heavy, gloomy, pathetic
11. Could not hear a melody
14. Dissonant sounds
15. Consonant sounds
18. Orderliness of structure

Statements reflecting characteristics present, but peripheral.

16. Masses or blocks of sounds

General Statement

This is a short choral work, with a formal structure of a repeated period. The melodic line is not obvious. It is generally dissonant, although at times quite consonant.

2. Willan, Healey - Rise up, my love, my fair one (Song of Solomon) (1929). Performed by the College-Conservatory of Music Chamber Singers, Lewis E. Whikehart, conducting. Duration - 1½ minutes.

Summary of Analysis

Statements reflecting characteristics that pervade the composition.

3. Sentimental, tender, pleading
10. Lyric melody
15. Consonant sounds
18. Orderliness of structure
26. Simple texture
30. Voice/choral color
35. Lack of strong rhythmic feeling

Statements reflecting characteristics significant, but only in a portion of the composition.

13. Changing tonality
21. Interweaving of melodies (contrapuntal)

Statements reflecting characteristics present, but peripheral.

none

General Statement

This work, by Willan, is quite traditional, being of the nineteenth century in derivation. It is formally a repeated period.

3. Lockwood, Norman - Monotone of the Rain (Carl Sandburg) (1937). Performed by the College-Conservatory of Music Chamber Singers, Lewis E. Whikehart, conducting. Duration - 2 minutes.

Summary of Analysis

Statements reflecting characteristics that pervade the composition.

4. Quiet, lyrical, satisfying, calm
15. Consonant sounds
18. Orderliness of structure
26. Simple texture
30. Voice/choral color
35. Lack of strong rhythmic feeling

Statements reflecting characteristics significant, but only in a portion of the composition.

10. Lyric melody

Statements reflecting characteristics present, but peripheral.

7. Dramatic, agitated, exciting, triumphant
21. Interweaving of melodies (contrapuntal)
31. Dynamic contrast of music

General Statement

This work is in ternary form, quite consonant, and utilizing a number of meter changes. It is traditional in style.

4. Barber, Samuel - *Mary Hynes*, Op. 16, No. 1, (James Stephens) (1942). Performed by the College-Conservatory of Music Chamber Singers, Lewis E. Whikehart, conducting. Duration - 2½ minutes.

Summary of Analysis

Statements reflecting characteristics that pervade the composition.

5. Humorous, light, graceful
6. Bright, cheerful, gay
15. Consonant sounds
18. Orderliness of structure
26. Simple texture
30. Voice/choral color

Statements reflecting characteristics significant, but only in a portion of the composition.

3. Sentimental, tender, pleading
10. Lyric melody
21. Interweaving of melodies (contrapuntal)

Statements reflecting characteristics present, but peripheral.

9. Irregular melodic contour, disjointed (angular)
31. Dynamic contrast of music
36. Irregular rhythms

General Statement

This work is in a binary period form with the pandiatonic and quasi-quartal style of Barber. It is quite consonant.

5. Dello Joio, Norman - A Fable (Vachel Lindsay)(1946). Performed by the College-Conservatory of Music Chorale, Lewis E. Whikehart, conducting, Ritter Werner, pianist. Duration - 3½ minutes.

Summary of Analysis

Statements reflecting characteristics that pervade the composition.

5. Humorous, light, graceful
6. Bright, cheerful, gay
15. Consonant sounds
18. Orderliness of structure
30. Voice/choral color
34. Repetitive rhythms

Statements reflecting characteristics significant, but only in a portion of the composition.

10. Lyric melody
13. Changing tonality
21. Interweaving of melodies (contrapuntal)
26. Simple texture
31. Dynamic contrast of music

Statements reflecting characteristics present, but peripheral.

1. Spiritual, serious, inspiring
7. Dramatic, agitated, exciting, triumphant
16. Masses or blocks of sounds
22. Chordal accompaniment of a single melody

General Statement

This Dello Joio work reverts to folk-song with melodic curves and a "cute" piano accompaniment in the most obvious ternary form. It is tonal and quite consonant.

6. Labunski, Felix - Two Madrigals (Jose Garcia Villa) (1960), (a) First, the poem must be magical. Performed by the College-Conservatory of Music Chamber Singers, Lewis E. Whikehart, conducting. Duration - 3 minutes.

Summary of Analysis

Statements reflecting characteristics that pervade the composition.

4. Quiet, lyrical, satisfying, calm
5. Humorous, light, graceful
10. Lyric melody
13. Changing tonality
15. Consonant sounds
18. Orderliness of structure
26. Simple texture
30. Voice/choral color
35. Lack of strong rhythmic feeling

Statements reflecting characteristics significant, but only in a portion of the composition.

21. Interweaving of melodies (contrapuntal)
34. Repetitive rhythms

Statements reflecting characteristics present, but peripheral.

none

General Statement

This first Labunski madrigal has an interesting chain phrase form, and is extremely simple and gratifying to the ears.

7. Labunski, Felix - Two Madrigals (Jose Garcia Villa) (1960), (b) The Clock. Performed by the College-Conservatory of Music Chamber Singers, Lewis E. Whikehart, conducting. Duration - 3 minutes.

Summary of Analysis

Statements reflecting characteristics that pervade the composition.

5. Humorous, light, graceful
6. Bright, cheerful, gay
13. Changing tonality
15. Consonant sounds
18. Orderliness of structure
26. Simple texture
30. Voice/choral color
34. Repetitive rhythms

Statements reflecting characteristics significant, but only in a portion of the composition.

11. Could not hear a melody.
21. Interweaving of melodies (contrapuntal)
23. Extreme pitch ranges (high-low) of the music

Statements reflecting characteristics present, but peripheral.

none

General Statement

The second Labunski madrigal has a "cute" text with obvious "tick-tock" effects. There is a vocal glissando at the end which brings the through-composed piece to a conclusion.

8. Ming, James - The Silent Slain (Archibald MacLeish) (1960). Performed by the College-Conservatory of Music Chamber Singers, Lewis E. Whikehart, conducting. Duration - 3 minutes.

Summary of Analysis

Statements reflecting characteristics that pervade the composition.

1. Spiritual, serious, inspiring
15. Consonant sounds
30. Voice/choral color

Statements reflecting characteristics significant, but only in a portion of the composition.

2. Heavy, gloomy, pathetic
4. Quiet, lyrical, satisfying, calm
10. Lyric melody
13. Changing tonality
14. Dissonant sounds
18. Orderliness of structure
26. Simple texture
34. Repetitive rhythms

Statements reflecting characteristics present, but peripheral.

7. Dramatic, agitated, exciting, triumphant
21. Interweaving of melodies (contrapuntal)
31. Dynamic contrast of music

General Statement

This work has some fine antiphonal effects. It is in the usual ternary form, but employs musical rhyme for coherence between dissimilar phrases.

9. Ming, James - Nat Bacon's Bones (Archibald MacLeish) (1960). Performed by the College-Conservatory of Music Chamber Singers, Lewis E. Whikehart, conducting. Duration - two minutes

Summary of Analysis

Statements reflecting characteristics that pervade the composition.

5. Humorous, light, graceful
12. Block chordal structure
13. Changing tonality
15. Consonant sounds
18. Orderliness of structure
26. Simple texture
30. Voice/choral color

Statements reflecting characteristics significant, but only in a portion of the composition.

7. Dramatic, agitated, exciting, triumphant
8. Majestic, martial, vigorous
11. Could not hear a melody
34. Repetitive rhythms

Statements reflecting characteristics present, but peripheral.

3. Sentimental, tender, pleading
14. Dissonant sounds

General Statement

This second work by Ming is humorous, and dramatic. It is also in ternary form, tonal and consonant.

10. George, Earl - Laughing Song (William Blake)(1956). Performed by the College-Conservatory of Music Chorale, Lewis E. Whikehart, conducting. Duration - 2 minutes.

Summary of Analysis

Statements reflecting characteristics that pervade the composition.

5. Humorous, light, graceful
6. Bright, cheerful, gay
15. Consonant sounds
18. Orderliness of structure
26. Simple texture
30. Voice/choral color
36. Irregular rhythms

Statements reflecting characteristics present, but peripheral.

7. Dramatic, agitated, exciting, triumphant
12. Block chordal structure
13. Changing tonality
33. Percussive rhythms

Statements reflecting characteristics present, but peripheral.

21. Interweaving of melodies (contrapuntal)
23. Extreme pitch ranges (high-low) of the music
31. Dynamic contrast of music

General Statement

This is an amusing work in strophic form with a "ha-ha-ha" refrain. This special effect dominates the composition.

11. Gaburo, Kenneth - Snow (1949). Performed by the College-Conservatory of Music Chamber Singers, Lewis E. Whikehart, conducting. Duration - 4 minutes.

Summary of Analysis

Statements reflecting characteristics that pervade the composition.

2. Heavy, gloomy, pathetic
15. Consonant sounds
18. Orderliness of structure
21. Interweaving of melodies (contrapuntal)
30. Voice/choral color
35. Lack of strong rhythmic feeling

Statements reflecting characteristics significant, but only in a portion of the composition.

4. Quiet, lyrical, satisfying, calm
5. Humorous, light, graceful
6. Bright, cheerful, gay
10. Lyric melody
11. Could not hear a melody

13. Changing tonality
16. Masses or blocks of sounds
26. Simple texture

Statements reflecting characteristics present, but peripheral.

7. Dramatic, agitated, exciting, triumphant
14. Dissonant sounds
25. Cluttered texture, busy music
31. Dynamic contrast of music

General Statement

This is an early work of Gaburo, therefore it is tonal and triadic. It is in ternary form, and very dramatic with fine quiet contrasts.

12. Gaburo, Kenneth - The Cry (F. J. Lorca)(1953). Performed by the College-Conservatory of Music Chamber Singers, Lewis E. Whikehart, conducting. Duration - 2 minutes.

Summary of Analysis

Statements reflecting characteristics that pervade the composition.

1. Spiritual, serious, inspiring
7. Dramatic, agitated, exciting, triumphant
15. Consonant sounds
17. Lack of recognizable structure
30. Voice/choral color

Statements reflecting characteristics significant, but only in a portion of the composition.

12. Block chordal structure
13. Changing tonality
21. Interweaving of melodies (contrapuntal)
26. Simple texture
31. Dynamic contrast of music

Statements reflecting characteristics present, but peripheral.

11. Could not hear a melody
14. Dissonant sounds
25. Cluttered texture, busy music
34. Repetitive rhythms

General Statement

The Cry is a later composition of Gaburo. It utilizes a generative form, and is very dramatic with little contrast from the prevailing mood. While it is tonal, there is some dissonance present (consonance is still more significant).

13. Gaburo, Kenneth - *Terra Tremuit* (1957). Performed by the College-Conservatory of Music Chamber Singers, Lewis E. Whikehart, conducting. Duration - 1 minute.

Summary of Analysis

Statements reflecting characteristics that pervade the composition.

1. Spiritual, serious, inspiring
9. Irregular melodic contour, disjointed (angular)
11. Could not hear a melody
15. Consonant sounds
18. Orderliness of structure
20. Sounds like atonal music
21. Interweaving of melodies (contrapuntal)
30. Voice/choral color
35. Lack of strong rhythmic feeling

Statements reflecting characteristics significant, but only in a portion of the composition.

14. Dissonant sounds

Statements reflecting characteristics present, but peripheral.

12. Block chordal structure
26. Simple texture

General Statement

This still later work by Gaburo is a twelve-tone, non-serial composition, illustrating his development toward modernity. The piece is very brief, and uses points of imitation to develop mood. The melody is disjunct and not obvious. Dissonant sounds are more obvious.

14. Whikehart, Lewis E. - *The Love of God* (Bernard of Rascus) (1958). Performed by the College-Conservatory of Music Chorale, Lewis E. Whikehart, conducting. Duration - 4 minutes.

Summary of Analysis

Statements reflecting characteristics that pervade the composition.

3. Sentimental, tender, pleading
4. Quiet, lyrical, satisfying, calm
10. Lyric melody
12. Block chordal structure
13. Changing tonality
15. Consonant sounds
18. Orderliness of structure
26. Simple texture
30. Voice/choral color

Statements reflecting characteristics significant, but only in a portion of the composition.

6. Bright, cheerful, gay
7. Dramatic, agitated, exciting, triumphant
31. Dynamic contrast of music
35. Lack of strong rhythmic feeling

Statements reflecting characteristics present, but peripheral.

16. Masses or blocks of sounds
21. Interweaving of melodies (contrapuntal)

General Statement

This work is in rondeau form, very tertian, tonal and consonant. It is very warm-hearted, bordering on the sentimental, with a most effective retardation employed in the returns of the refrain.

15. Stravinsky, Igor - Kyrie from the Mass (1948). Performed by the College-Conservatory of Music Chorale, Lewis E. Whikehart, conducting, Ritter Werner, organist. Duration - 3 minutes.

Summary of Analysis

Statements reflecting characteristics that pervade the composition.

1. Spiritual, serious, inspiring
3. Sentimental, tender, pleading
11. Could not hear a melody
12. Block chordal structure
15. Consonant sounds
18. Orderliness of structure
26. Simple texture
30. Voice/choral color
35. Lack of strong rhythmic feeling

Statements reflecting characteristics significant, but only in a portion of the composition.

9. Irregular melodic contour, disjointed (angular)
13. Changing tonality
21. Interweaving of melodies (contrapuntal)
34. Repetitive rhythms

Statements reflecting characteristics present, but peripheral.

14. Dissonant sounds
16. Masses or blocks of sounds

General Statement

The "Kyrie" is in a brief sequence form, somewhat disjunct, with a basic tonality of C major.

16. Stravinsky, Igor - Agnus Dei from the Mass (1948). Performed by the College-Conservatory of Music Chorale, Lewis E. Whikehart, conducting, Ritter Werner, organist. Duration - 2 minutes.

Summary of Analysis

Statements reflecting characteristics that pervade the composition.

1. Spiritual, serious, inspiring
3. Sentimental, tender, pleading
10. Lyric melody
13. Changing tonality
15. Consonant sounds
18. Orderliness of structure
21. Interweaving of melodies (contrapuntal)
26. Simple texture
30. Voice/choral color
35. Lack of strong rhythmic feeling

Statements reflecting characteristics significant, but only in a portion of the composition.

none

Statements reflecting characteristics present, but peripheral.

12. Block chordal structure
14. Dissonant sounds

General Statement

The "Agnus Dei" is a pale, abstract work, brief, through-composed using points of imitation.

17. Ogdon, Wilbur - A Clear Midnight (Walt Whitman), from "Five Statements" (1958-62). Performed by the College-Conservatory of Music Chamber Singers, Lewis E. Whikehart, conducting. Duration - 1 minute.

Summary of Analysis

Statements reflecting characteristics that pervade the composition.

1. Spiritual, serious, inspiring
9. Irregular melodic contour, disjointed (angular)
13. Changing tonality
15. Consonant sounds
26. Simple texture
30. Voice/choral color
35. Lack of strong rhythmic feeling

Statements reflecting characteristics significant, but only in a portion of the composition.

2. Heavy, gloomy, pathetic
17. Lack of recognizable structure
18. Orderliness of structure

Statements reflecting characteristics present, but peripheral.

6. Bright, cheerful, gay
7. Dramatic, agitated, exciting, triumphant
12. Block chordal structure
14. Dissonant sounds
16. Masses or blocks of sounds
21. Interweaving of melodies (contrapuntal)
31. Dynamic contrast of music

General Statement

This first of the three Ogdon works is through-composed in form. It uses a very attractive forte-piano effect in the basses for textual emphasis.

18. Ogdon, Wilbur - Madrigal (Thomas Campion), from "Five Statements" (1958-62). Performed by the College-Conservatory of Music Chamber Singers, Lewis E. Whikehart, conducting. Duration - 1 minute

Summary of Analysis

Statements reflecting characteristics that pervade the composition.

6. Bright, cheerful, gay
15. Consonant sounds
30. Voice/choral color

Statements reflecting characteristics significant, but only in a portion of the composition.

7. Dramatic, agitated, exciting, triumphant
10. Lyric melody
12. Block chordal structure
13. Changing tonality
14. Dissonant sounds
21. Interweaving of melodies (contrapuntal)
35. Lack of strong rhythmic feeling
36. Irregular rhythms

Statements reflecting characteristics present, but peripheral.

none

General Statement

This work is an extremely brief composition, consisting only of a period. It is bright and gay in effect.

19. Ogdon, Wilbur - The Last Invocation (Walt Whitman), from "Five Statements" (1958-62). Performed by the College-Conservatory of Music Chamber Singers, Lewis E. Whikehart, conducting. Duration - 2 minutes.

Summary of Analysis

Statements reflecting characteristics that pervade the composition.

7. Dramatic, agitated, exciting, triumphant
11. Could not hear a melody
18. Orderliness of structure
30. Voice/choral color

Statements reflecting characteristics significant, but only in a portion of the composition.

4. Quiet, lyrical, satisfying, calm
12. Block chordal structure
14. Dissonant sounds
15. Consonant sounds
26. Simple texture
35. Lack of strong rhythmic feeling

Statements reflecting characteristics present, but peripheral.

13. Changing tonality
16. Masses or blocks of sounds
21. Interweaving of melodies (contrapuntal)
25. Cluttered texture, busy music

General Statement

This third composition by Ogdon is also a brief period in form. A striking characteristic is the use of sprechstimme in a pianissimo level.

20. Toch, Ernst - Geographical Fugue (1930). Performed by the College-Conservatory of Music Chorale, Lewis E. Whikehart, conducting. Duration - 3 minutes.

Summary of Analysis

Statements reflecting characteristics that pervade the composition.

5. Humorous, light, graceful
6. Bright, cheerful, gay
7. Dramatic, agitated, exciting, triumphant
11. Could not hear a melody
15. Consonant sounds
18. Orderliness of structure
21. Interweaving of melodies (contrapuntal)
26. Simple texture
27. Strange orchestral effects
30. Voice/choral color
31. Dynamic contrast of music
34. Repetitive rhythms

Statements reflecting characteristics significant, but only in a portion of the composition.

36. Irregular rhythms

Statements reflecting characteristics present, but peripheral.

none

General Statement

The "Geographical Fugue" itemizes places on the map, using the rhythmic spoken work, with imitation in augmentation, diminuation and stretto. It is a very humorous, well-appreciated work.

21. Rochberg, George - Psalm 23 (1954). Performed by the College-Conservatory of Music Chorale, Lewis E. Whikehart, conducting. Duration - 3 minutes.

Summary of Analysis

Statements reflecting characteristics that pervade the composition.

1. Spiritual, serious, inspiring
10. Lyric melody
15. Consonant sounds
30. Voice/choral color

Statements reflecting characteristics significant, but only in a portion of the composition.

3. Sentimental, tender, pleading
4. Quiet, lyrical, satisfying, calm
7. Dramatic, agitated, exciting, triumphant
13. Changing tonality
14. Dissonant sounds
18. Orderliness of structure
21. Interweaving of melodies (contrapuntal)
26. Simple texture
31. Dynamic contrast of music
35. Lack of strong rhythmic feeling

Statements reflecting characteristics present, but peripheral.

2. Heavy, gloomy, pathetic
12. Block chordal structure
16. Masses or blocks of sounds
23. Extreme pitch ranges (high-low) of the music
36. Irregular rhythms

General Statement

This work provides a very dramatic modern setting of the familiar text. The form is a chain phrase with points of imitation reaching a climax through augmented triads and quartal harmony. Overall it is lyric and consonant in effect.

APPENDIX I

Stylistic Analyses of Compositions Performed at the Fifth and Sixth Concerts

The fifth concert of the Exposition of Contemporary American Music was presented on Saturday, May 8, 1965, in Wilson Memorial Hall on the University of Cincinnati campus. The performing group was the Cincinnati Symphony Orchestra. The sixth concert, a repetition of the fifth concert, was presented on Sunday, May 9, 1965, in Withrow Court, on the Miami University campus in Oxford, Ohio.

The Saturday evening performance represented premiere performances for each composition. The order of the program was as follows:

1.	Tetrameron	Russell Smith
2.	Threnody for Strings	Robert Lombardo
3.	Variazione	George H. Crumb
4.	Zodiac	George Rochberg
5.	Three Pieces for Orchestra	Leo Kraft
6.	Samson Agonistes	Robert Starer

1. Smith, Russell - Tetrameron. Performed by the Cincinnati Symphony Orchestra, Max Rudolf, conducting. Duration - 12 minutes.

Summary of Analysis

Statements reflecting characteristics that pervade the composition.

10. Lyric melody
18. Orderliness of structure

Statements reflecting characteristics significant, but only in a portion of the composition.

3. Sentimental, tender, pleading
4. Quiet, lyrical, satisfying, calm
5. Humorous, light, graceful
15. Consonant sounds
21. Interweaving of melodies (contrapuntal)
26. Simple texture
28. Wind instrument color
29. Strong instrument color
34. Repetitive rhythms

Statements reflecting characteristics present, but peripheral.

9. Irregular melodic contour, disjointed (angular)
13. Changing tonality
14. Dissonant sounds
16. Masses or blocks of sounds
23. Extreme pitch ranges (high-low) of the music
25. Cluttered texture, busy music
27. Strange orchestral effects
31. Dynamic contrast of music
32. Percussion color
36. Irregular rhythms
37. Tempo or speed of the music

General Statement

Tetrameron, which is written in one movement for full orchestra, was completed in New York City in 1957. The work has been recorded in a performance by the Japanese Philharmonic, Akeo Watanabe conducting.

The word "Tetrameron" means, literally, four parts. These include a sustained yet intense opening section, a lively scherzo, a contrapuntal section which rises to a climax, and a modified restatement of the opening. Like all of Smith's writing, the work is clear, expressive, at times startling, and economical in style, with a strong lyric strain.

The work is highly consonant, lyrical and conservative. There are basically two moods found in the composition: the lyrical opening section (sections three and four are similar), and the scherzo. The strings carry most of the thematic materials with a few woodwind soli. The use of percussion is very sparse. The rhythm is metrical. Rhythmic patterns are mostly regular (with very few irregularities). References to chordal texture are inappropriate since there is very little use of chords _qua_ chords in this work. Pizzicato strings are used extensively. Most of the time the texture is quite simple. It is an expressive, neo-Romantic composition.

2. Lombardo, Robert - _Threnody for Strings_. Performed by the Cincinnati Symphony Orchestra, Max Rudolf, conducting. Duration - 9 minutes.

Summary of Analysis

Statements reflecting characteristics that pervade the composition.

2. Heavy, gloomy, pathetic
18. Orderliness of structure
21. Interweaving of melodies (contrapuntal)
29. Strong instrument color

Statements reflecting characteristics significant, but only in a portion of the composition.

1. Spiritual, serious, inspiring
3. Sentimental, tender, pleading
10. Lyric melody
14. Dissonant sounds
15. Consonant sounds
26. Simple texture
35. Lack of strong rhythmic feeling

Statements reflecting characteristics present, but peripheral.

4. Quiet, lyrical, satisfying, calm
9. Irregular melodic contour, disjointed (angular)
12. Block chordal structure
13. Changing tonality
16. Masses or blocks of sounds
20. Sounds like atonal music
23. Extreme pitch ranges (high-low) of the music
25. Cluttered texture, busy music
37. Tempo or speed of the music

General Statement

The Threnody for Strings was composed in 1964, in memory of John F. Kennedy, and was completed on November 11th just prior to the first anniversary of the late President's death.

The work in mood is "sorrowful" and is played at slow tempo throughout. There are three main ideas, beginning in the 'cellos, continued in the violas and then in the violins. A soft opening is brought to a climax three times. During the third development the solo viola is prominent. At the close the music dies away.

In its melodic and contrapuntal structure the work makes a strong emotional impact, employing as many different colors as the string orchestra can provide.

The melodic element is predominantly lyrical with only a few passages that could be described as "angular." The consonance/dissonance quotient is difficult to evaluate. When the music settled on a sonority long enough for it to "register" it is generally fairly consonant (triad, quintal chord, etc.). The emphasis in the work is linear, however, and the counterpoint is very dissonant. Tritones and minor second/major seventh clashes are common.

The work is moderately slow tempo throughout. Predominantly sorrowful and lamenting in nature (hence the title), pathetic, pleading, gloomy, serious, and inspiring might all be valid mood responses. Highly contrapuntal with intense, involuted melodic lines throughout. The rhythmic element is not prominent. There is no significant use of dynamics, no significant tempo variation other than some subtle tempo modicifations.

The composition is "grey" and monochromatic with little in the way of contrasts to sustain the listener's interest. On the other hand it is quite inoffensive in style.

3. Crumb, George H. - Variazions. Performed by the Cincinnati Symphony Orchestra, Max Rudolf, conducting. Duration - 20 minutes.

Summary of Analysis

Statements reflecting characteristics that pervade the composition.

18. Orderliness of structure
20. Sounds like atonal music
27. Strange orchestral effects
31. Dynamic contrast of music

Statements reflecting characteristics significant, but only in a portion of the composition.

4. Quiet, lyrical, satisfying, calm
7. Dramatic, agitated, exciting, triumphant
8. Majestic, martial, vigorous
9. Irregular melodic contour, disjointed (angular)
11. Could not hear a melody
14. Dissonant sounds
16. Masses or blocks of sounds
23. Extreme pitch ranges (high-low) of the music
26. Simple texture
28. Wind instrument color
29. String instrument color
32. Percussion color
33. Percussive rhythms
34. Repetitive rhythms
35. Lack of strong rhythmic feeling
36. Irregular rhythms
37. Tempo or speed of the music

Statements reflecting characteristics present, but peripheral.

3. Sentimental, tender, pleading
12. Block chordal structure
15. Consonant sounds
19. Disjointed series of sounds (pointillistic)
25. Cluttered texture, busy music

General Statement

This composition for orchestra was written in 1959. The work demands a considerably enlarged orchestra, though its full weight is felt in only three of the eight movements. The plan for a smaller orchestra within the larger framework is used to achieve the maximum in color and texture. Each of the eight movements has its own orchestration.

In formal structure, as the composer explains, Variazions does not follow the conventional pattern of theme, variations, and coda. It adds another dimension in the form of fantasy-pieces, which serve as 'digressions.' Thus, there are three distinct entities in this piece ---- theme, variations, and fantasia. All of the variations are derived from the original theme but the 'Fantasia' sections are independent of any formal association with it.

The original theme uses the twelve-tone row . . . . Variation 1 is played Pezzo antifonale (antiphonal piece), in which the strings alone are heard. Variation 2 is a toccata, which is followed by the First Fantasia, Notturno. The next section, Variation 3 is a scherzo. Then comes the Trio Estatico, Variation 4, which is the centerpiece of the entire structure and quotes the original theme in full. Variation 5, Da capo: Burlesca, is followed by a second Fantasia, Cadenza, in which percussion is heard, with harp, celesta, and mandolin. The seventh section, Variation 6, is an Ostinato. The eighth and final part, Fantasia ---- Variazions: Elegia a coda: Tema, rounds out the work by combining all of the entities ---- theme, variation, and fantasy ---- and employing all the instruments of the orchestra.

This is highly colorful music with truly brilliant use of the orchestra. Specific orchestral effects include use of glissandi (particularly in the strings), prominence of the harp and celesta, use of mandolin (including a long cadenza) and bird calls in the first Fantasia section. It is very successful in the overall formal structure. The general effect is almost kaleidoscopic in the variety of colors used.

The principal effect of the piece comes from (1) the coloristic use of the orchestra, (2) the effective formal structure, (3) the intensity and drive of the rhythm in the more agitated sections, and (4) the contrasting slow sections that could be described as "hushed, dreamlike, intense, wistful, nostalgic and introspective."

The composition uses practically every device in the 20th century composer's "bag of tricks." It is the personality here, however, that pervades the work, rather than any specific technical considerations. The dissonance quotient is quite high, but this is somewhat mitigated by the colorful instrumentation, texture, and spacing. The actual effect is not of a high dissonance level. There seems to be no discernable use of counterpoint.

4. Rochberg, George - Zodiac. Performed by the Cincinnati Symphony Orchestra, Max Rudolf, conducting. Duration - 15 minutes.

Summary of Analysis

Statements reflecting characteristics that pervade the composition.

9. Irregular melodic contour, disjointed (angular)
11. Could not hear a melody
14. Dissonant sounds
17. Lack of recognizable structure
19. Disjointed series of sounds (pointillistic)
20. Sounds like atonal music
25. Cluttered texture, busy music
27. Strange orchestral effects
32. Percussion color
36. Irregular rhythms

Statements reflecting characteristics significant, but only in a portion of the composition.

2. Heavy, gloomy, pathetic
3. Sentimental, tender, pleading
7. Dramatic, agitated, exciting, triumphant
8. Majestic, martial, vigorous
23. Extreme pitch ranges (high-low) of the music
28. Wind instrument color
29. String instrument color
31. Dynamic contrast of music
33. Percussive rhythms
34. Repetitive rhythms
35. Lack of strong rhythmic feeling
37. Tempo or speed of the music

Statements reflecting characteristics present, but peripheral.

1. Spiritual, serious, inspiring
12. Block chordal structure
16. Masses or blocks of sounds
21. Interweaving of melodies (contrapuntal)
26. Simple texture

General Statement

Zodiac is a version for large orchestra of an earlier and well-known set of piano pieces, Bagatelles, which Rochberg composed in 1952. The present work, written in August, 1964, is dedicated to the memory of Paul Rochberg, the composer's son, who died at the age of twenty. The work grew out of the composer's interest in the orchestral possibilities he had long believed lay dormant in the piano piece. Bagatelles used the twelve-tone style of composition, as does Zodiac, with essential changes required by the larger medium.

The work consists of 12 brief movements (duration of the shortest movement 30 seconds, of the longest, about two minutes). The 12 movements are divided into five groups, with a brief pause at the end of each group.

Group A Movement 1: Drammaticaments
2: Scherzoso
3: Con brio
Group B Movement 4: Tempo di marcia
5: Quasi Parlando
6: Satirico

Group C Movement 7: Teneramente e liricamente
8: Giocoso
9: Intenso, con un sentimento di destino
Group D Movement 10: (There is no heading here but the movement displays a dance-like lilt).
11: Con moto, passionatamente
Group E Movement 12: Burlesca (Envoi)

The composition is acerbic, pointillistic, lean, dynamic and atonal throughout, frequent stops and starts, many interruptions and changes of meter, mood, tempo, texture, etc. To the untrained listener the initial effect of the piece may well sound unmelodic, dissonant, cluttered, disorganized, discontinuous, and disoriented.

The most influential factors are (1) the discontinuity (pointillism), (2) the use of the orchestra (very individualistic), (3) the unpredictability of the piece and (4) the vivid imagination of the composer.

The orchestral sound is very heavy on percussion (of all types), muted brass, open brass, string pizzicati. There is very little doubling. Chords are most often scored in mixed colors rather than families of instruments. There is much use of staccato articulation. All of this is very similar to Arnold Schoenberg's use of the orchestra, even to the preferred sonorities: chords with one perfect fourth and one tritone, major seventh dissonances, etc. Strange effects such as flutter tongue, col legno, etc., are also employed.

5. Kraft, Leo - Three Pieces for Orchestra. Performed by the Cincinnati Symphony Orchestra, Max Rudolf, conducting. Duration - 11 minutes.

Summary of Analysis

Statements reflecting characteristics that pervade the composition.

none

Statements reflecting characteristics significant, but only in a portion of the composition.

1. Spiritual, serious, inspiring
3. Sentimental, tender, pleading
5. Humorous, light, graceful
7. Dramatic, agitated, exciting, triumphant
8. Majestic, martial, vigorous
9. Irregular melodic contour, disjointed (angular)
10. Lyric melody
14. Dissonant sounds
17. Lack of recognizable structure
18. Orderliness of structure
19. Disjointed series of sounds (pointillistic)
20. Sounds like atonal music
21. Interweaving of melodies (contrapuntal)
23. Extreme pitch ranges (high-low) of the music
25. Cluttered texture, busy music
26. Simple texture
27. Strange orchestral effects
28. Wind instrument color
29. String instrument color
31. Dynamic contrast of music
32. Percussion color
33. Percussive rhythms
34. Repetitive rhythms
36. Irregular rhythms
37. Tempo or speed of the music

Statements reflecting characteristics present, but peripheral.

2. Heavy, gloomy, pathetic
4. Quiet, lyrical, satisfying, calm
12. Block chordal structure
13. Changing tonality
15. Consonant sounds
16. Masses or blocks of sounds
22. Chordal accompaniment of a single melody
35. Lack of strong rhythmic feeling

General Statement

Three Pieces for Orchestra was composed in 1962-1963 and is dedicated to the composer's wife.

This composition for large orchestra has no program and the three pieces are not related thematically. Kraft describes the first piece ("Slow, singing") as "a large aria for orchestra." The melody is introduced by the violins. After an interlude for kettledrums and trumpets, a varied form of the melody is heard in the winds. The strings then develop the main idea of the melody and bring it to a climax, and a quiet epilogue closes the movement.

The second piece ("Fast, driving") is a symphonic Allegro in character, follows the ternary or three-section form (A-B-A). The first section is predominantly rhythmic, the second lyric. The concluding section combines a recapitulation and Coda.

The third piece, which uses a larger percussion section, begins and closes in a slower tempo, with a fast episode in its center. The meter here is less definite than in the two preceding movements.

A great amount of stylistic diversity is contained in these pieces. All but four of the statements would be a valid response to a portion of this work. Highly intense and dramatic pieces with a lot of unpredictability. Actually so many things happen that the pieces do not really hang together ---- either as a set or as logical entities themselves. The actual stylistic idiom is similar to Rochberg's. They both feature the same lean kind of orchestral texture with few doubling, considerable brass writing (often muted), much percussion, extreme registers, etc.

The major factors are (1) the use of the orchestra, (2) the irregular rhythm and meter, and (3) the melodic content which is quite lyrical in the slower sections.

6. Starer, Robert - Samson Agonistes. Performed by the Cincinnati Symphony Orchestra, Max Rudolf, conducting. Duration - 14 minutes.

Summary of Analysis

Statements reflecting characteristics that pervade the composition.

18. Orderliness of structure
26. Simple texture
34. Repetitive rhythms

Statements reflecting characteristics significant, but only in a portion of the composition.

3. Sentimental, tender, pleading
5. Humorous, light, graceful
7. Dramatic, agitated, exciting, triumphant
8. Majestic, martial, vigorous
9. Irregular melodic contour, disjointed (angular)
10. Lyric melody
14. Dissonant sounds
15. Consonant sounds
16. Masses or blocks of sounds
21. Interweaving of melodies (contrapuntal)
22. Chordal accompaniment of a single melody
23. Extreme pitch ranges (high-low) of the music
27. Strange orchestral effects
28. Wind instrument color
29. String instrument color
31. Dynamic contrast of music
32. Percussion color
33. Percussive rhythms
36. Irregular rhythms

Statements reflecting characteristics present, but peripheral.

2. Heavy, gloomy, pathetic
12. Block chordal structure
13. Changing tonality
19. Disjointed series of sounds (pointillistic)
20. Sounds like atonal music
24. Ornamentation of melodies
37. Tempo or speed of the music

General Statement

Samson Agonistes was composed during the summer of 1963. Although the work is based on a ballet score written for Martha Graham in 1961, it is entirely new in form, structure and orchestration.

In the words of the composer, "the work does not attempt to portray the external events of Samson's life; it rather deals with the conflict between strength and weakness within." In musical style, Mr. Starer points out, Samson Agonistes contains serial (twelve-tone) elements, as well as free thematic development. Two twelve-tone rows permeate the entire work and much of the thematic development in the five sections is derived from them.

The first row is introduced by the violins soon after the beginning of the opening section, Non troppo lento. The second row is presented by the piano during the Presto scherzando section that follows. The three remaining sections --- Andante, Allegro moderato, and Molto allegro --- develop a symphonic portrait of the Biblical hero.

The two twelve-tone rows may be said to represent the opposed aspects of Samson's character. At a first listening, however, one might be wise to surrender his mood to the work as a whole rather than try to analyze the variants of the tone-rows. As Starer says, "composition technique is only a means to artistic expression." Although he belongs to no musical school, he is definitely a modernist, but his work is characterized by a combination of clarity and individuality.

This work is a much more traditional piece than either Rochberg or Kraft, especially in the use of the orchestra (more in the idiom of the 19th century) and the traditional melodic Fortspinnung. It contains some obvious Judaisms: melodic use of the augmented second interval, squealing high woodwinds, brass chords in open fifths with dotted rhythmic patterns (one is reminded of Bloch's Schelomo). It sounds like movie music, very enjoyable upon a sensory level and somewhat disappointing in intellectual dimensions. It is easily perceptible music, containing frequent reprises and much use of the principal melodic motives which become quite familiar by the twentieth repetition. Quasi-jazz rhythms appear in several sections. Effective use is made of the piano as a solo instrument.

Stylistically the work shows the influence of Miklos Rosza, Dimitri Tiomkin, Ernest Block, Paul Hindemuth --- definitely in the Germanic academic tradition. The dissonance level is moderate. There is little use of triads but great use of open fifth sonorities. The melodic content varies from extremely lyrical to extremely "angular," but the former predominates. Portions of the piece are probably atonal, but most of it is very perceptibly tonal. It is serial, but used very freely throughout. The serialism is used primarily to derive themes and has little other causal effect on the work. Rhythm is an important factor. It is lively, bouncy, and tends toward "motor rhythm" at times.

APPENDIX J

Stylistic Analyses of Compositions Used in Part II of the Study

There were four compositions which were used in Part II of the Study. The four works were initially recorded on magnetic tape and utilized in connection with the special instruction which was incorporated into the experimental design of the study. They were later performed at a special concert for the 1277 pupils who participated in the Study. For the taping and the concert the performing group was the College-Conservatory of Music Woodwind Quintet, a group composed of first chair members of the Cincinnati Symphony Orchestra. The four compositions used in the Study were:

Pastoral	Vincent Persichetti
Quintet Theme and Variations	David Diamond
Quintet No. 2 Andante con moto Allegro commodo Adagio Vivace	Alvin Etler
Quintet No. 2 Allegro Allegro	William Sydeman

1. Pastoral Vincent Persichetti

A. Data: A six-minute for woodwind quintet, written circa 1950. Tempo marking: moderato with only minor tempo variations throughout.

B. Technical Analysis: Highly conservative in style, featuring lyrical melodic lines, diatonicism, a clear tonality (on A, close to A major although one could not say that the piece is "in key", ending upon an A major triad and emphasizing diatonic portions of the A major scale).

The piece contains much counterpoint, particularly in 2-voice textures. The frequent sonorities in this work are the minor 7th, major 7th, and major-minor 7th chords with some use of quintal chords and considerable use of open fifths as a drone bass. There is almost no use of tritonic or minor second dissonances.

The rhythmic element is prominent, particularly in the middle section which is slightly reminiscent of a "barn dance." The rhythm is metrical, quite even, featuring repetitive rhythmic patterns. The range of rhythmic values runs between the half note and the sixteenth. There is only a slight use of changing meters in the middle section and no polyrhythmic activity.

The piece begins quietly, gather momentum and rhythmic activity, rises to a climax and then subsides at the conclusion. The thematic material all generates from the opening theme in the flute with its counter-line in the clarinet. The textures are fairly light and open with only occasional use of the full group. Chord spacings are often very wide-spread. The two predominant textures are (1) melody over sustained chords and (2) an active rhythmic line in one instrument (or doubled) punctuated by staccato and sharply-rhythmic chords. Extremes of range are not exploited.

2. Quintet David Diamond

A. Data: A three-movement composition lasting 16-17 minutes of which half is taken by the middle movement, the Theme and Variations. It was written in 1958 on a commission by the Fromm Music Foundation. Only the second movement was utilized in Part II of the study.

B. Technical Analysis:

> Theme and Variations: A very slow, very short theme followed by 14 brief variations; a "scherzino" interlude separates variations 7 and 8.

The most important fact about this composition is its use of serialism. The entire work is based upon one tone row. The first movement is comparatively strict in the use of the row; the second and third movements use it more freely. The row contains no tritones and only one minor second. Despite the overwhelming preponderance of consonant intervals in the row, the work fairly bristles with sharp dissonances, both melodically and harmonically. Obviously the row is mostly a "springboard" for the melodic basis of the piece. The piece is quite atonal---most cadences are upon dissonant chords or are purely melodic---there is virtually no implication of any tonal center and hardly any diatonic scale lines. The row is used in the classical Schoenberg manner---inversions, transpositions, possibly retrograde, frequent and obvious use of augmentation and diminution, segmentation of the row (usually into groups of four notes).

The melody is angular, has an extremely wide range, is fragmentary, has many wide leaps, and passes frequently from one instrument to another. The harmony features very dissonant sonorities. Actually there is hardly any harmonic dimension to the piece and very little use of chords qua chords. Contrapuntal textures predominate, and chordal sections usually move so quickly that the ear does not have time to settle on any vertical sonorities.

There is an extremely varied and complex use of rhythm--irregular rhythmic patterns, much syncopation, short rests and fermatas, sudden tempo modifications, non-metrical rhythms, changing meters, polyrhythmic effects, etc. The rhythm is most regular in the middle movement. The total effect is one of discontinuity and pointillism. Extreme contrasts of dynamics appear frequently, and dynamic extremes are exploited.

The central core of the work and by far the most interesting movement is the second. The theme is only five bars long and is entirely melodic. Each variation changes tempo slightly; one is a Viennese waltz that sounds much like Schoenberg. The theme is a distortion of the original row and is broken into three parts: specifically (A) a distortion of notes 11, 10, 9, and 8 in retrograde, (B) the minor second interval, notes 7 and 8, and (C) a "straigntening out" of notes 7, 6, 5, and 4 in retrograde. The variation process here is simply a free use of these motives in different rhythmic, melodic, and contrapuntal contexts. It is interesting to note that in the final variation the tones appear in the form of the original row. Diamond is "putting his house in order."

3. Quintet No. 2 Alvin Etler

A. Data: A four-movement work lastihg about 16 minutes written in 1957. Stylistically, Etler seems to show a great deal of the influence of Paul Hindemuth.

B. Technical Analysis: Rhythm is the most important element in this piece, 3 of the 4 movements have considerable rhythmic activity, and the tempi are predominantly brisk. These three movements are in simple duple meter with no changes of meter or tempo. Regular, repetitive rhythmic patterns are featured, "motor" rhythm, some syncopation, "percussive" rhythms.

The tonality is clearly defined by the melodic lines, the cadences (cadences upon major triads, open fifths, etc.), in obviously tonal root successions (final V - I cadences in bass), and in the use of pedal points on the tonic and the dominant. The tonal centers of the four movements are:

F - B_b - E - F .

The melody is regular, of moderate range, quite diatonic, and fairly conjunct. The sonorities are only mildly dissonant with frequent triads, seventh chords, and quartel chords. The texture is predominantly contrapuntal, although in the sense of developing motives extracted from the main themes rather than in formally imitative procedures. There is a lot of melodic doubling--

unisons and octaves--Etler has quite an ear for effective combinations of instruments.

The texture is rather light-- when there is imitation, no more than three parts are usually involved. This is not "busy" music in the sense of a lot going on; the focus of musical activity is easy to detect. Etler uses the quintet medium very skillfully. This quintet, more than the other three, exploits the colors of the medium. The Diamond and Sydeman quintets are so complicated musically that the ear is not able to concentrate on the purely sonorous aspects of the music; this work is simpler and thus easier to perceive.

4. Quintet No. 2 William Sydeman

A. Data: This presentation covers the first two movements of Sydeman's second woodwind quintet. Each movement lasts about 3 - 4 minutes.

B. Technical Analysis: This composition is undoubtedly the most controversial and "difficult" work of the four, primarily due to its "discontinuity"; melodically and rhythmically it is choppy and fragmentary and is totally devoid of the continuous motivic thematic development typical of our European/American musical tradition. Here the emphasis is primarily linear. Tempo is an important factor in the work and is almost constantly in the process of modification: tempo changes are frequent as are retardandi and accelerandi. Sometimes these tempo fluctuations are subtle, sometimes extreme. The rhythmic patterns are extremely irregular, ametrical, with much syncopation, polyrhythms, use of dynamic extremes, etc. There is virtually no feeling of meter at all, because no rhythm is regular or persistent enough to suggest one.

This is not a serial piece, but it is atonal. Sonorities are highly dissonant. A typical harmonic texture is one that consists of sustained chords with one voice changing at a time. He is also fond of passages containing chords formed by instruments entering one by one and then slowly dissolving until only one instrument is left.

The melody is angular, disjunct, discontinuous, atonal, unpredictable, and has an extremely wide range.

Formally the two movements are as follows:

I - Slow introduction - faster middle section - slow ending

II - Scherzo: much rhythmic activity, fast throughout.

Bibliography

Brunk, H. D. *An Introduction to Mathematical Statistics*. Boston: Ginn & Company, 1960.

Downey, J., & Knapp, G., "The Effects on a Musical Programme of Familiarity and of Sequence of Selection," *The Effects of Music*, (1927), 223-243.

Downie, N. M., & Heath, R. W. *Basic Statistical Methods*. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1965.

Gilliland, A. R., & Moore, H. T., "The Immediate and Long-time Effects of Classical and Popular Phonograph Selections," *The Effects of Music*, (1927), 211-222.

Hevner, K., "The Theories of Aesthetic Appreciation," *Studies in Appreciation of Art*. Eugene, Ore.: University of Oregon Publications, IV, No. 6, 1934.

Hornyak, R. R., "A Factor Analysis of the Relationships between Components of Music Present in Selected Music Examples and the Preference Rating Responses of College Students to the Selected Music Examples," Unpublished Mus. Ed. D. dissertation, Indiana University, 1964.

Krugman, H. E., "Affective Response to Music as a Function of Familiarity," *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, XXXVIII, (1943), 388-392.

Mull, H. K., "The Effect of Repetition Upon the Enjoyment of Modern Music," *Journal of Psychology*, XLIII (1957), 155-162.

Owen, D. B. *Handbook of Statistical Tables*. Reading, Mass: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, Inc., 1962.